Layering of Size and Type Noun Constructions in English

Topics in English Linguistics
74

Layering of Size and Type Noun Constructions in English

by

Lieselotte Brems

De Gruyter Mouton

Acknowledgements

This book could not have been written without the input and encouragements of several people. First of all I want to thank my supervisor Kristin Davidse for taking me on as a PhD student, for generously sharing her time to discuss ideas and carefully commenting on texts, always alert and to the point. It is probably not done to use the topic of the book to quantify my gratitude, but I'll do it anyway: heaps and heaps of thanks, Kristin, for everything you have done for me over the years. I also thank my co-supervisor Hubert Cuyckens for introducing me to grammaticalization in his MA course and for his comments on the grammaticalization chapter in this book.

I am grateful to a number of other people for careful comments on the manuscript and help with the publication process, i.e. Lieven Vandelanotte, my series editor Elizabeth Traugott, Birgit Sievert, Angelika Hermann and Jurgen Benteyn. I also warmly thank my colleagues at the Department of Linguistics for interesting chats on linguistic and non-linguistic topics.

For having faith in me and encouraging me I thank my parents, my sister, and my boyfriend Dries, my personal MacGyver. Finally, I want to dedicate this book to the memory of my grandmother, Leonie Verbeeck.

Table of contents

Part I
Preliminaries

Chapter 1
Description of the topic and state of the art

1.1 Description of the topic: Sort of a lot of size and type nouns

This study aims at a systematic corpus-based description of two, originally, binominal structures and the development of their extended uses. On the one hand, I look at structures that incorporate a size noun expression, i.e. a nominal expression that describes size or shape, implying a measure, such as *a bunch of*, *heaps of*, *a bit of*, *a jot of*, etc. On the other hand, I look at structures with a type noun expression, i.e. a nominal expression to do with (sub)categorization, i.e. *sort of*, *kind of* and *type of*.

These two types of structures will be referred to as size noun constructions and type noun constructions respectively (henceforth also SN-constructions and TN-constructions). The specifics of each construction type as well as potential functional overlap between them will be accounted for within a constructional framework in the vein of usage-based Goldbergian Construction Grammar (Goldberg 2006).[1] Both SN-constructions and TN-constructions are originally binominal noun phrases, in that they consist of two nouns connected by the preposition *of*. These two nouns each allow for premodification by adjectives and/or determiners, i.e. identifiers or quantifiers. Both initial construction types can hence be schematized as (D) (M) N1 *of* (D) (M) N2, where N1 is instantiated by a size noun (henceforth also SN)[2], or a type noun[3] (henceforth also TN) respectively. (D) refers to optional determiners and (M) to optional (adjectival) modification of both nouns. In certain extended uses of SN- and TN-constructions the N2-slot opens up to non-nominal syntactic categories, such as adjective, adverb and verb. In addition, there are some uses that are more or less external to the structure of the NP and hence equally stretch beyond the boundaries of the schema proposed here.

Binominal and extended uses of both types of construction display what seem to be polysemous uses in synchronic corpus data. The main aim of this study is to classify these various uses in terms of synchronic layering, i.e. to see them as the co-existing synchronic sediments of diachronic processes of change (cf. Hopper 1991). As many of these uses have not been described adequately yet, this will require identifying clear "form-meaning pairings ([subsuming] lexical collocation, syntactic structure and semantics-pragmatics)" (Traugott 2010b: 45), based on the study of extensive sets of synchronic corpus data. On the basis of carefully chosen diachronic case studies, it will be argued that the synchronic classification attested by SN-constructions and TN-constructions can be interpreted in terms of paths of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification.

Let us take a look at a number of instantiations of both construction types. In the original binominal syntagms N2 is typically a plural count noun or uncount noun in the case of SN-constructions, whereas it can be singular count, plural count or uncount in the case of TN-constructions.[4] (1.1)-(1.4) are examples of NP-internal SN-constructions; (1.5)-(1.8) exemplify TN-constructions, with (1.8) being an NP-external use (the SNs and TNs are in bold):[5]

(1.1)   Such is the fable of "The Fox and the Grapes", in which a fox, unable to reach a **bunch** of grapes that hangs too high, decides that they were sour anyway (implied moral: It is easy to spurn what we cannot attain. (CW-USbooks)[6]

(1.2)   He threw himself on the floor, he kicked a couple of dishwashers and washing machines and knocked a **load** of stuff off the top of the washers. (CW-UKspoken)

(1.3)   He said: "A **bunch** of drunken, brain-dead louts seem determined to disgrace our team." (CW-Sunnow)

(1.4)   Isn't there a **bit** of a double standard there? (CW-NPR)

(1.5)   My grandfather had a curly moustache and offered two **sorts** of kisses: an ordinary flat kiss or a tickling kiss reserved for when we had been extra good. (CW-OZnews)

(1.6)   The problem was that the Bush administration said the funding should come from the cities and states. The cities and states said they didn't have this **kind** of money. (CW-NPR)

(1.7)   This is why im crazy about u. in a non-'worship and serve me forever' **typa** way ;-) (www.7thrimofhell.blogspot.com/1990/blog-post)

(1.8)   I've **sort** of become part of the mountain bike world in a way without actually having a mountain bike; it's quite strange. (CW-UKspoken)

The SN- and TN-constructions focused on in this study are part of a larger set of structures that fit the proposed binominal schema.[7] Some of these constructions do not seem to be explicitly related to the very specific constructional semantics of SN- or TN-constructions, e.g. *of*-apposition patterns such as *the city of Rome* or genitive constructions, such as *a friend of*

Warhol's. However, this more extensive binominal set also includes (time) prepositional expressions, such as *on the edge of*, *on the brink of* and *on the verge of*, which display patterns of polysemy and seem to have engaged in processes of change similar in certain respects to those observed for SN- and TN-constructions (cf. Vanden Eynde 2003). Nevertheless, this set of prepositional expressions have their own particular semantics and will not be discussed in this study, unless when relevant in comparison with the evolutions observed for SN- and TN-constructions, or as corroborative evidence for some of the claims made for SNs and TNs.

This study zeroes in on SN- and TN-constructions for a number of reasons, both theoretical and descriptive in nature. The main reason for looking at TN- and especially SN-constructions is of a descriptive nature. Examples (1.1) to (1.8) already to some extent bear out what constitutes the main descriptive-analytical challenge of both constructions, and why they are so often considered as intractable material in the literature. The obvious question in any binominal syntagm is: which of the two nouns is the head and what is the status of the other noun? The central question with regard to both SNs and TNs, within the specific binominal structure they instantiate, is hence also one of a structural and semantic nature. The two main analytical options can be simplified at this point as head versus non-head or modifier status. Corpus and Internet examples (1.1) to (1.8) serve to illustrate that this decision is not a straightforward one in terms of *either/or* in each instance separately, let alone in all instances of SN- or TN-constructions as a whole. Instead, both SNs and TNs, each in their own way, show a very intricate and multidimensional interplay between grammatical and lexical status, which in addition to clear-cut black or white cases also gives rise to a substantially large grey area, itself a microcosm of different shades. Important factors determining structural and semantic status are collocational patterns, based on the habitual co-occurrence of SN- or TN-nodes and collocates (cf. Robins 1971 and Crystal 1991), as well as semantic prosody, i.e. the context-dependent preference of nodes for positive, neutral or negative collocates, e.g. the verb *cause* as a node typically has a negative semantic prosody as it usually teams up with negative collocates, such as *accident* or *damage* (cited in Stubbs 1995: 25; see also Robins 1971, Crystal 1991, Bublitz 1996 and Louw 1993). Other lexical-syntagmatic factors are premodification patterns of the SN/TN and N2, e.g. *a foot-high pile of manure* (CW-Today), *a whole load of new clothes* (CW-Sunnow), *Not the remotest jot of nostalgia* (CW-Times), *a rare type of infection* (CW-UKephem) and (1.7) *a non-'worship and serve me forever' typa way*. This will be discussed in more detail in Sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.2. In addition and partially overlapping, the interaction between the functional zones of categorization, modification and determination in the prenominal string of the English NP is important, where categorization has to do with the specifica-

tion of a type as such, modification adds further classifying and/or qualitative attributes to this type specification, and determination is concerned with signalling identifiability status of the referent of the NP (cf. Bache 2000; see Section 2.1.2).

Let us return to examples (1.1) to (1.8) and quickly run through them to get a better grasp of these analytical issues. In *a bunch of grapes* (1.1) and *two sorts of kisses* (1.5) the SN and TN seem to be the dominant elements within the binominal NP, both on semantic and formal grounds. In (1.1) the SN has the lexically very specific and collocationally restricted meaning of a constellation of entities growing or fastened together at one end. The noun in the *of*-phrase then specifies what the bunch consists of, in this case *grapes*, and both nouns are coextensive. Ultimately, the NP is about a bunch, which in this context refers to a spatially continuous composite entity (cf. Halliday's definition of the Thing within the nominal group: see Section 2.1.1). In example (1.5) the TN expresses its literal meaning of (sub)categorization with regard to the noun in the *of*-phrase, in this case two subtypes of the superordinate type 'kisses'. The specific subtypes are then described after the colon. In *A bunch of drunken, brain-dead louts* (1.3) and *I've sort of become part of the mountain bike world* (1.8) the meanings of the SN and TN display a clear semantic shift from those expressed in examples (1.1) and (1.5). In (1.3) *bunch of* refers to a quantity of people, without reference to the specific and collocationally restricted cluster meaning, and seems to express added evaluative meaning. In (1.8) *sort of* moves beyond the binominal structure and does not denote strict subcategorization; rather, it seems to do the opposite, i.e. hedge the denotation of the verbal predicate *become part of.* Examples (1.3) and (1.8) hence exemplify non-head or modifier status. A formal corollary of this non-head status in (1.3) is that, as opposed to (1.1), the SN does not seem to control verb agreement, since the verb is plural.

Examples (1.2) as well as (1.4), (1.6) and (1.7) then are more difficult to classify, in that they each in their way lie at different points between the analytical poles of head versus non-head status. In *a load of stuff* (1.2) the meaning of the SN hovers between referring to an actual load and just designating quantity as such. In *a bit of a double standard* (1.4) *bit of a* expresses more than just a small quantity and further activates implicatures of intersubjective hedging meaning, mitigating the force of the proposition. In *a non-'worship and serve me forever' typa way* (1.7) the TN fits into the binominal structure in a different way than in *two sorts of kisses* (1.5). There is greater cohesion between the TN, the nonce attribute in front of it as well as *of*, which appears to have merged with the TN orthographically as well. *Typa* seems to have suffix-like status, which ties in with a specific stress pattern of non-salience for the TN-expression. In *this kind of money* (1.6) the TN together with the demonstrative in front of it form a (complex)

anaphoric determiner which provides complex identification information by referring to some generalized standard amount of money that, in this case, cities and states may have (cf. De Smedt, Brems and Davidse 2007). All of these types of meaning will be discussed in greater detail in Sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 and especially in the corpus studies in Part 2. At this point, examples (1.1) to (1.8) serve to indicate that the formal and semantic status of SNs and TNs within binominal and other structures is not clear-cut.

The structural ambivalence of SNs and TNs also has repercussions at clause level, most notably on the question of subject-verb concord whenever the SN/TN-nominal occurs in subject position, as already noted for (1.1) and (1.3). In the extended uses where the N2-slot is sometimes taken up by non-nominal categories or when the SN/TN has an NP-external function, structural status is also an important and knotty question. Some instances of SN- and TN-constructions ultimately seem to resist disambiguation for several (good) reasons and prove to remain irreducible 'blends' (Bolinger 1961) of head and modifier status.

In addition to similarity in descriptive concerns, there is another reason for looking at SN-constructions *as well as* TN-constructions, which pertains to a particularity in the literature on both constructions. As the literature survey in Section 1.2 will show, SN- and TN-constructions are traditionally discussed together; in general reference grammars, such as the Quirk grammars, as well as in (topic-specific) theoretically-oriented ones, such as Halliday and Matthiessen (2004). However, the literature does not put forward well-argued reasons for this joint treatment, in terms of fundamental synchronic and/or diachronic correspondences in their constructional semantics for instance. Most authors lump SN- and TN-constructions together almost exclusively on the basis of formal similarities in the surface structures of both constructions (as indicated in the binominal schema described earlier). In both constructions the SN or TN usually receives a default head analysis. Both constructions have, however, also been noted to display incongruous concord patterns, where the verb and the apparent head noun disagree in number, as in (1.3) for instance.

These incongruities are treated as unsystematic "idiomatic anomal[ies]" (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik 1985: 765) or contextual idiosyncrasies restricted to informal contexts. Hardly ever are they considered as potentially systematic symptoms of SNs and TNs' constructional semantics possibly in flux, and if so, no further comments or generalizations are made. The incongruity is mostly described as notional or proximity concord violating strict grammatical concord. The possibility that head function can shift from the SN/TN to another element of structure in at least some cases is usually not considered. Yet, this would explain why the SN/TN does not behave like a head, both semantically and formally, in

some of the incongruous instances and would make ad hoc and a posteriori justifications in terms of notional or proximity concord unnecessary.

Sometimes cautious remarks are made about quantifier-like uses of SN-expressions such as *load(s) of*, but the only further explanation of this quantifier function is that it is restricted to informal or colloquial registers and disapproved of in other contexts, e.g. (willy-nilly prescriptive-)descriptive Quirk et al. (1985: 264 footnote) and explicitly corpus-based Biber, Johansson and Leech (1999: 254-255). With regard to TNs too systematic remarks are restricted to observing rather well-established regional differences in distribution between TNs, e.g. that *kind of* is preferred in American English, while *sort of* is typical of British English (Biber et al. 1999: 256). No unified classifications of different SN/TN-uses are made other than distinguishing between various SNs in terms of their source semantics, e.g. container SNs versus shape SNs (cf. Biber et al. 1999 and Dodge and Wright 2002). In sum, the joint discussion of SN- and TN-constructions is not accounted for by explicit reference to fundamental parallels between the similarities in structural realization on the one hand, and similarities in the semantics of both constructions on the other. Both SN- and TN-constructions are mainly presented as intractable material 'riddled with idiosyncrasies' (Jackendoff 1981: 103) that seems to slip through the system of grammar in a supposedly unpredictable way. The similarities and anomalies are furthermore rather straightforwardly posited in most grammars, without in-depth descriptive back-up by means of corpus analysis. The literature on SNs and TNs will be reviewed in greater depth in Section 1.2.

The main objective of this study is to account for the individual descriptive specifics of SN-constructions and TN-constructions separately. In addition, both construction types will also be related by assessing similarities and dissimilarities between them from an essentially semiotic constructionist perspective, i.e. by looking at them in terms of form-meaning pairings, thereby filling a gap in the literature, which only saw similarity in the pure shape of the constructions. The question of similarities will be mainly one of potential functional overlap between or engagement in similar changes of the two constructions. The key question overarching SN- and TN-constructions hence is: in which way or ways can and do they instantiate the determination – modification - categorization schema referred to earlier, with determination subsuming both identification and quantification (cf. Langacker 1991)?

The various constructional uses attested by SN- and TN-syntagms are essentially looked at in terms of synchronically coexisting meanings. In addition, it is argued that both SN-constructions and TN-constructions have and are engaged in (ongoing) processes of delexicalization and grammaticalization, with grammaticalization understood as

> the change whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions, and once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions. (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 18)

Hopper and Traugott's definition is one of the standard definitions of grammaticalization, but certainly not the only one. The concept of grammaticalization will be discussed in much more detail in Chapter 3, where certain vexed questions in the debate on what should be included in the definition are reviewed, and a motivation is provided for the definition that will be used in this study. The polysemy and structural ambivalence of the constructions attested in corpus and Internet data, such as examples (1.1) to (1.8), is then argued to be the synchronic result of diachronic processes of pragmatic inferencing interacting with grammaticalization. Grammaticalization has become a busy field of linguistic study these days and studies have prototypically dealt with verbal structures. The present study wants to make a contribution to a relatively under-studied environment in grammaticalization, i.e. the noun phrase (some exceptions are Adamson 2000, Aijmer 2002, Breban 2010, Brems 2001, 2003a and 2004a, Denison 2002, Paradis 2000 and Traugott 2008a and b).

Chapter 2 presents a cognitive-functional model of the English NP that accommodates the synchronic polysemy of SN- and TN-syntagms, and adds a specific grammaticalization framework to fully account for the dynamicity of these patterns within the NP and beyond, incorporating basic tenets from usage-based construction grammar (Goldberg 2006) and collocation studies (e.g. Hunston and Francis 2000).

Based on extensive sets of synchronic corpus data and diachronic case studies, Part 2 then discusses the synchronically layered uses of several sets of SN- and TN-expressions in great detail. In addition, these descriptive observations evoke theoretically-focused research questions about the nature of grammaticalization as such, and its relation to key notions like subjectification, collocational patterns, constructional schematicity, reanalysis, analogy and frequency.

First, Sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 of this introductory chapter will delineate SN- and TN-constructions separately with attention to the descriptive issues specific to each construction, as well as the potential theoretical repercussions of these on a theory of grammaticalization. Section 1.1.1 will introduce a further distinction within the set of SN-constructions between regular SNs and small SNs, which each bring in issues particular to them, as well as share the fundamental reanalysis from head to non-head status.

1.1.1 Size noun constructions

The main focus of this study is a systematic description of the layered polysemous uses of SN-constructions as manifested by extensive sets of synchronic corpus data. Compared to TN-constructions, SN-constructions have received very little attention in the literature and in corpus research, and attempts at functionally motivated classifications within a unified constructional account are virtually non-existent.

In a second step it will be argued that the semantic and structural ambivalence, already succinctly exemplified by (1.1) to (1.4), can be interpreted as the synchronic result of ongoing processes of delexicalization and grammaticalization, which are motivated by the language user's need for expressive means of quantification and evaluation. The grammaticalization framework is dynamic enough to account for this layered polysemy as a semi-stable system of SN-uses, instead of the unpredictable chaos it is often made out to be (see status quaestionis in Section 1.2). It allows me to describe the various SN-uses as the combined (interim) results of diachronic processes of change.

SNs were described earlier as nouns with size implications. The SN-construction is a productive pattern for non-canonical coding of quantification that is furthermore sensitive to fashion and renewal (Hopper and Traugott 2003). For instance, in the sixties things typically came in *bags* or *bagsful*, as in *bagsful of fun* (personal communication M. A. K. Halliday and Eirian Davies), which is now a dated expression that has been superseded by new topical expressions such as *loads of* and *heaps of fun*. The list of SNs to choose from for this study is endless, as new (nonce-)expressions continue to crop up, potentially associated with regionally restricted varieties of English (see Trousdale 2010b on such SNs as *hella*, *gob* and *wodge*). Therefore several restrictions were made. In this study two subsets of SNs are included, distinguished on the basis of the kind of size they imply or denote. On the one hand, there are the regular SNs, which designate a relatively large quantity, and on the other there are the semantically more specific small SNs (henceforth also SSNs), which all imply or incorporate small to very small quantities in their lexical make-up. Semantically more schematic quantifiers such as *many/much* and *little/few* can equally be scaled into such subsets.

1.1.1.1 Regular SNs

For the case studies on regular SNs corpus extractions were made on the following singular and plural expressions occurring in and beyond binominal constructions: *bunch*, *bunches*, *heap*, *heaps*, *load*, *loads*, *pile* and *piles*. The synchronically coexisting uses of this subset revolve around a difference between uses with head versus modifier status. Examples (1.9) and

(1.10) exemplify SN-constructions with *pile* in which the SN functions as the dominant element of the binominal noun phrase:

(1.9)   A **pile** of bodies mounted up, like a barricade of flesh, around the sweating, cursing, straining Soviet strongpoint. (CW-UKbooks)

(1.10)   A jilted girlfriend got revenge on the boyfriend who dumped her by dumping a foot-high **pile** of manure in his bed. (CW-Today)

In (1.9) the verb phrase *mounted up* makes clear that *pile* is used in its lexical meaning of 'a heap of things laid or gathered upon one another' (*The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*) and calls up a specific constellation that takes up space and hence has referential meaning. Similarly, in (1.10) premodifier *foot-high* makes it clear that *pile* refers to a particular constellation consisting of what is specified by the *of*-phrase. In (1.1) in *delete* an additional syntactic argument for head status was the concord between the SN and the verb. I will refer to these uses as lexical head constructions.

In examples (1.11) to (1.14), on the other hand, the SNs display different semantic and syntactic behaviour:

(1.11)   Modesty was eventually restored, but not before a **heap** of people in Pine Rivers had become privy to intimate knowledge what Santa wears beneath those baggy pants. (CW-OZnews)

(1.12)   All this idea of 'there's nothing for people to do' it's a **load** of codswallop of course. (CW-UKspoken)

(1.13)   What can beat calling the entire politically correct movement a **bunch** of second-rate drinkers and third-rate Marxists? (CW-OZnews)

(1.14)   The 'surrogate mum' to princes William and Harry shared **heaps** of fun with them at a fair yesterday while father Charles was otherwise engaged. (CW-Today)

The N2s in *a heap of people* (1.11) and *a bunch of second-rate drinkers* (1.13), just like in *a pile of bodies* (1.9), refer to humans, but in (1.11) and (1.13) reference is not to a literal heap or bunch of them, but a large quantity of people as such. The lexical constellation meaning of the SNs *heap* and *bunch* is nearly completely backgrounded. The N2 collocates in *a load of codswallop* (1.12) and *heaps of fun* (1.14) refer to abstract and uncount concepts that cannot be stacked. In (1.14) *heaps of fun* hyperbolically refers

to 'a lot of fun'. In addition to, or maybe instead of, quantifier meaning (1.12) and (1.13) seem to incorporate increased subjective, evaluative meaning. Rather than quantifying the N2 referent, the SN-expressions serve to further evaluate them (negatively).

For this reason Chapter 4 will distinguish between two main grammaticalized uses, a quantifier use on the one hand and a more evaluative quantifier use on the other. The latter will be called *valuing quantifier*, which reflects its evaluative function as well as refers to the emotive value of N2 in these uses. The developmental path of valuing quantifiers involves grammaticalization-cum-attitudinal subjectification, with subjectification here referring to the shift from propositional meaning to the encoding of speaker-related meanings, in the sense of attitudes or beliefs, with regard to the propositional content (e.g. Traugott 2010b).

Besides examples that seem to have either head or modifier status there is also an extensive set of data in which the lexical constellation semantics and the grammatical quantifier meaning are both referred to in various ways, intentionally or not, as in

(1.15)   I would take up a **pile** of commonplace books like Lord David Cecil's *Library Looking Glass*, John Julius Norwich's *Christmas Crackers*, Rupert Hart-Davis's *A Beggar in Purple*, etc. (CW-UKmags)

(1.16)   We found **loads** of tapes parcelled up for delivery. Many were recent releases. (CW-Sunnow)

(1.17)   Those who must deal with them on a regular basis and wish to get the better of them must employ much patience, deviousness and duplicity as well as lorry **loads** of insincere flattery. (CW-Today)

(1.18)   Well, possibly not, but if you were expecting to find spade **loads** of hubris heaped high on DPW's first post-EMI outing, you'd be sorely mistaken. (CW-UKmags)

(1.19)   The British have forged a fine tradition of gardening and cannot afford to sit on their well-clipped laurels. Striding past the compost **heap** of nostalgia, comes Christopher Lloyd. (CW-Times)

(1.20)   Rather than doing it word for word Yeah he's wanting to do **bunches** of words or something at the same time. (CW-UKspoken)

Examples (1.15) to (1.20) show the quintessential feature of SN-expressions, i.e. the often intricate interplay between their lexical and grammatical status, but in an intensified way. In *a pile of commonplace books* (1.15) and *loads of tapes* (1.16) *pile* and *loads* respectively can be interpreted as referring either to the lexical denotation of the SN, or as having quantifier meaning based on the size implications of these SNs. In (1.17) to (1.19) the premodifiers of the SN *loads*, *lorry* and *spade*, rekindle the lexical semantics of the SN, but at the same time a quantifier meaning is conveyed in what are highly expressive contexts. In *the compost heap of nostalgia* (1.19), again there seems to be both reference to a lexical *heap* that can be walked around and a quantity of N2, i.e. *nostalgia*. In (1.20) *bunches of words* refers to 'several words', but also evokes a cluster meaning which derives from the lexical meaning of *bunch*, and which for instance incorporates temporal contiguity (*at the same time*).

   Examples (1.15) to (1.20) hence all incorporate an ambivalence, even though they do not all have the same status. The classification of SN-uses proposed in Chapter 4 will account for such ambivalent uses in terms of vague and ambiguous uses, and grammaticalized quantifier uses with lexically persistent SNs. I will set up generalizations about their constructional semantics, as well as frame them within an ongoing process of grammaticalization and delexicalization. I will also look at differences in terms of degrees of grammaticalization, and will discusses prosodic and lexical factors in this as well as differences between the singular and plural forms of SNs. As a further sign of the intricate interplay between lexical and grammatical meaning layers, it will be noted that the lexical source semantics of most SNs always remain (latently) present in their grammaticalized quantifier uses and can be alluded to or exploited to fit the speaker's need for more expressivity, as in *lorry loads of insincere flattery* (1.17) (cf. Hopper 1991).

   Meanings expressed by SNs outside of the binominal construction are also taken into account, either as extended, NP-external uses arising in a diachronic process, or in order to check whether these constructional semantics feed into other SN-uses. Regular SNs display what one might label adverbial or degree modifier uses, in which *of* is typically left out (cf. Quirk et al. 1985, Langacker 2009 and to appear, and Traugott 2010b): regular SNs can be used to modify verbs, e.g. (1.21) to (1.23), (mainly comparative) adjectives, as in (1.24) and (1.25), and adverbs (1.26):

(1.21)   Zoe, whose favourite tipple is Jack Daniels, insists she doesn't drink **loads**. (CW-Sunnow)

(1.22)   "Perhaps you could suggest you're too old," he offered sullenly. "Thanks a **bunch**." (CW-UKbooks)

(1.23)   "Having them down here during the season will help me **heaps**," said Vander-Kuyp, who was fifth in the 110m hurdles. (CW-OZnews)

(1.24)   I miss the old Valley Pool. The new one is **heaps** better, of course, but I pity the children who have to attend school carnivals there. (CW-OZnews)

(1.25)   With Crass they failed to notice it totally and we're like f ing **loads** softer than that. (CW-UKmags)

(1.26)   And there'll be plenty more spectacular action with 6-a-side matches and mini soccer for the younger visitors, video displays of some of the world's greatest games, interviews with stars past and present and **loads**, **loads** more. (CW-UKmags)

The adverbial uses are very similar in meaning to the hyperbolic quantifier uses in binominal constructions, only the syntactic environment is different.

In addition to case studies on English SN-expressions, a study using data on Dutch SN-expressions such as *hopen* ('heaps'), *stelletje* and *zootje* ('bunch') will be included as corroboration of the two developmental paths set out for the English expressions (see Section 4.8 in Chapter 4). This comparative study confirms the existence of these two main paths, even though it also points up cross-linguistic differences in their specific development.

1.1.1.2 Small size nouns

In this subset of SNs distinct factors are at work in addition to collocational shifts. The notions of polarity sensitivity (Israel 2004), frequency and analogy (Hoffmann 2004) as well as pragmatic values of downtoning and intensifying come into play which are not that prominent in the other subset of SNs. As opposed to the regular SNs, the SSNs looked at in this study, except for bit, are all infrequent and rare lexical items, e.g. jot, skerrick, scintilla. Frequency has alternatively been seen as a prerequisite, symptom or consequence of grammaticalization and the possibility of infrequent items grammaticalizing hence touches on the basic tenets of grammaticalization as such, and calls for alternative explanations. Following Hoffmann (2004), a bit of will be considered but also partially rejected as possible analogical model for the grammaticalization of the other, infrequent SSNs in Chapter 5 (cf. Hoffmann 2004). The concepts of frequency and analogy as possible mechanisms of change add very specific issues to the gram-

maticalization processes of SSNs in comparison with the regular SNs and TNs.

Examples (1.27) to (1.42) exemplify all of the SSNs looked at in this study within a binominal context and beyond. Incidentally, the grammaticalized uses of SSNs, except bit and jot, normally stay within this binominal context. Examples (1.27), (1.29), (1.31) and (1.33) illustrate the original, fully lexical meaning of the SSNs while the other examples represent non-head uses. In the examples with *bit*, in addition to the head use, at least four kinds of non-head uses need to be distinguished, which can be related to increased subjectification, intersubjective values, and various discourse schemata. The head use example for *bit* (1.33) derives from a diachronic corpus, i.e. The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (henceforth YCOE)[8]

(1.27)   If you're lucky you'll catch a **whiff** of cat's pee! (CW-UKephem)

(1.28)   There is an unpleasant **whiff** of scapegoat-hunting in the latest assault on the banks to come from Deputy Premier Tom Burns. (CW-OZnews)

(1.29)   "Why is it," he said in a voice soaked in Irish charm, "that I want so much to tear every **shred** of clothing off your body?" "What's the matter, you don't like the dress?" (CW-UKbooks)

(1.30)   "I accept absolutely Mr Costello's statement to me that there's not a **shred** of truth in these allegations," said Senator Evans. (CW-OZnews)

(1.31)   A **flicker** of light from the flames licked her lips and stained them crimson. (CW-UKbooks)

(1.32)   It's all I look forward to; at the end of the day it gives me a **flicker** of comfort. (CW-UKbooks)

(1.33)   […] wid attorcoppan **bite** […] ('As a treatment against the bite of a spider') (YCOE)

(1.34)   He took a **bit** of apple.

(1.35)   "I love the colour brown," says Nyree "which is why I chose a brown carpet and curtains. Add a little **bit** of pink and you have a very cosy room on winter nights." (CW-UKmags)

(1.36)   "I'm going to test you now Gwyneth so you we've got an exami-
        nation coming up now **bit** of a an oral examination." (CW-
        UKspoken)

(1.37)   Life hasn't got any better under the new manager. The first thing
        he said to me was "I hear you are a **bit** of a troublemaker." (CW-
        UKmags)

(1.38)   "A word, Matt. I'd like you to do a run-through with Lotte. She's a
        bit iffy – " the director rotated his right hand palm down – "know
        what I mean?" (CW-UKbooks)

(1.39)   The pace of change introduced by technological progress is such
        that if our attention lapses for even one generation, a **smidgen** of
        time on any geological scale, transformations in the land that are
        truly dangerous could catch us unawares. (CW-USbooks)

(1.40)   Mr Bullock says there is not one **skerrick** of evidence to involve
        this man. (CW-OZnews)

(1.41)   They may yet force through the proposals but they won't make a
        jot of difference to the way the game's mishandled here. (CW-
        Sunnow)

(1.42)   This latest twist gives credibility to our argument all along that
        there is not a **scintilla** of evidence against Michelle of (a) having
        used a banned substance or (b) physically manipulating the sam-
        ple. (CW-Sunnow)

Bit of seems to have gone through a typical process of grammaticalization
with the quantifier meaning gradually emerging in particular restricted con-
texts that activate the size implications of the SN, still visible in synchronic
examples such as *a bit of apple* (1.34). In later stages it can function as a
quantifier without the support of these specific contexts, e.g. *a little bit of
pink* (1.35), and eventually it extends to other syntactic environments, as in
a bit iffy (1.38). The quantifier uses of infrequent SSNs seem to arise in
specific polarity sensitive contexts and are tied to specific collocational
patterns and discourse schemata, which, contrary to *bit of*, they continue to
be restricted to. In *not one skerrick of evidence* (1.40) for instance *skerrick*
as a quantifier typically features in negative polarity contexts in which it
has emphatic meaning, such as the reactive discourse characteristic of court
cases (cf. Brems 2010). Such restrictions render Hoffmann's proposal for

analogy with a frequent structural variant somewhat problematic: more complex analogical mechanisms seem to be at work.

These specific questions with regard to the grammaticalization of SSNs feed into the general debate on issues such as grammaticalization by analogy and the levels of constructional schematicity involved in grammaticalization (see Fischer 2007, Trousdale 2010a, and Chapter 3). The corpus study on SSNs presented in Chapter 5 will argue for an account that integrates these notions in a careful way.

1.1.2 Type noun constructions

TN-constructions are mainly discussed here in comparison with SN-constructions. As opposed to the latter, the versatile behaviour of TNs already attracted the attention of the great descriptive grammarians of the first half of the 20th century such as Kruisinga (1925) and in recent years their relevance to the study of grammaticalization and discourse patterns has made them into something of a hot topic in English studies. However, there is no agreement in the literature about a systematic, formally motivated classification of their different uses, especially NP-internal functions, which also pose the greatest descriptive problems. Chapter 6 will work towards such a systematic grammatical description, again based on extensive sets of synchronic and diachronic data of three common TNs, i.e. *sort*, *kind* and *type*. This allows me to investigate whether and where SN-constructions and TN-constructions show functional overlap in terms of what their constructional semantics can express.

Just as with SN-uses the basic distinction within the TN-uses centres on head versus modifier status of the TN. Example (1.43) illustrates a head noun construction with the TN *type*.

(1.43)   The late-17th century console has an elaborate top inlaid with agate and pietra paesina, a rare **type** of marble which in its colours and veining looks like a paesaggio or landscape. (CW-UKmags)

Such head noun uses typically construe relations of (sub)categorization and express generic meaning. In (1.43) for instance *pietra paesina* is classified as a rare subtype of the superordinate category 'marble'. In modifier uses, on the other hand, the TN is semantically demoted from this taxonomic meaning and takes on various other semantics depending on the type of modifier use. Some examples are (1.44) to (1.53):

(1.44)   A little cheaper Ole Works Inn (495 4837) seems like a laid-back **sort** of a place and sits handily on Cane Garden Bay across the road from Quito's Gazebo. (CW-Times)

(1.45)   This is why im crazy about u. in a non-'worship and serve me forever' **typa** way ;-). (http://www.7thrimofhell.blogspot.com/ 1990/01/blog-post)

(1.46)   I could never afford a boat, nor an oceanside house (Marianne is editor of the Nantucket Inquirer and Mirror) because we don't have that **kind** of money. (CW-Times)

(1.47)   "When we came under pressure the lads literally threw themselves in front of the ball," Wilkins said. "If we continue with that **sort** of attitude we can stay up." (CW-Times)

(1.48)   Jonathan Cope was the **kind** of guy who feels slightly ill at ease at parties but manages to look terrific nonetheless. (CW-Times)

(1.49)   The principle of earth sheltering is the same, whether applied to homes above or below the ground. An 18in covering of earth acts as a **kind** of blanket. (CW-Times)

(1.50)   Then later in the night we took a walk in our underwear around the campus. That was **sorta** weird. (http://www.yaledailynews.com/ article.asp)

(1.51)   My father was a skilled worker and er he was part of er sort of er a gang which was **sort** of recruited to be taken overseas for construction of railway. (COLT)[9]

(1.52)   How do they behave. Well **sort** of like. Oh it's hard to explain isn't it. It's like. She thinks she's the best but she's not. (COLT)

(1.53)   He **kinda** went, 'Yeah, I think so!' (www.rockconfidential.com/ Testament)

In *a laid-back sort of a place* (1.44) and a *non-'worship and serve me forever' typa way* (1.45) *sort of* and *typa* are phonetically reduced, reflected in writing in the case of *typa*, and do not indicate a true subtype. Rather, together with the adjective preceding it, the TN-expression is concerned with ascribing an attribute to a concrete hotel in (1.44), or with describing a very specific instance of loving in (1.45). In (1.46) to (1.48) the TN is preceded

by a demonstrative or definite determiner, and together with it expresses a phoric relation as well as gives information about identifiability status. In (1.47) *that sort of attitude* anaphorically refers back to the previous sentence and generalizes over it to set up a contextual type that includes the concrete instance referred to in the previous discourse and potentially extends over more instances not explicitly referred to in the discourse. The same goes for *the kind of guy* in (1.48); the only difference is that the information for decoding the referent's identity, which the definite determiner signals to be retrievable, is located in the following discourse, i.e. cataphorically, in the relative clause. In *that kind of money* (1.46) identification of the NP's referent is not established by means of phoric reference to qualities, but based on quantitative notions, which have to be retrieved anaphorically in this example, i.e. the amount of money assumed necessary to buy a boat.

In (1.49) again not a real subtype of, in this case, a blanket is described, but *the principle of earth sheltering* is described metaphorically in terms of a non-prototypical member of the category 'blanket'. The type specification 'blanket' is qualified, i.e. the appropriateness of the categorial label is questioned or mitigated (cf. Aijmer 2002, Denison 2002). Examples *sorta weird* (1.50) and *sort of recruited* (1.51) are adverbial uses of the TN-expression, similar to those of SNs in examples (1.21) to (1.26) and (1.38). The semantics here are also of the qualifying kind, as in (1.49), but apply to another syntactic context. In (1.52) the TN-expression functions as a discourse marker, similar to *like*, which is often used with it. It then functions as a hesitation marker, or can, among other things, function as a mere filler. The TN-expression in (1.53) functions as a quotative marker introducing quoted speech.

In conclusion, it can be noted that both (S)SNs and TNs take on various functions, centering around head versus modifier status, as attested by synchronic and diachronic corpus data. General reference grammars, such as Quirk et al. (1985) and Biber et al. (1999), however, cannot account for this variation, either synchronically or diachronically. In addition, theoretically-oriented work, such as transformationalist accounts in the vein of Akmajian and Lehrer (1976) lack the dynamicity necessary to tackle construction types that are essentially on the move within and beyond the NP, with nouns proceeding to take on functions not typically associated with them. Even Halliday's (1994) metafunctional proposal cannot fully accommodate the different uses of SNs and as such is too static to be descriptively accurate. It is only the cognitive framework proposed by Langacker (1991) and grammaticalization studies by Aijmer (2002), Denison (2002) and Traugott (2010b) that offer a point of departure for a systematic classification of the various uses of SNs and TNs, which allows me to compare both in terms of

potential zones of functional overlap with regard to the constructional semantics they can express.

Section 1.2 will present a detailed overview of the literature on the subjects of SN-expressions and TN-expressions.

1.2 State of the art: reference grammars and theoretically-oriented literature on size and type nouns

This section offers a survey of the relevant literature for SNs and TNs and the constructions in which they function. As noted earlier, SN-expressions and TN-expressions are often discussed together in the literature, but this body of text rarely points out semantic or constructional similarities between the two syntagms. Systematic functional descriptions of each individual construction are likewise hard to find.

In the case of SN-constructions the literature most clearly lacks a unified functional-constructional approach and is largely restricted to separate observations scattered over different sections in reference works. In more traditional grammars, such as Quirk et al. (1972) and (1985) for instance, they are not treated as a topic and construction in their own right, but discussed in sections dealing with their deviant subject-finite concord or other agreement patterns. Systematic analyses of the quantifying potential of SNs are largely lacking in existing grammars and are mostly restricted to observing that they are incongruent means of quantification.

Because of the joint treatment of SNs and TNs found in more traditional grammars, the literature often overlaps for both constructions. Nevertheless, I will survey the literature for both constructions in two separate sections, as TNs have received much attention in recent years, especially in the field of grammaticalization. In addition there are a small number of specialist studies on both subjects.

1.2.1 Discussions of SNs in the literature

The literature reviewed here subsumes traditional word class grammars, such as Quirk et al. (1972) and (1985), as well as some corpus-based grammars, such as Biber et al.'s (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, and several older descriptive grammars, such as Kruisinga (1925) and (1932), Poutsma (1928) and Jespersen (1932) and (1970). Finally, more specialized studies, such as Akmajian and Lehrer (1976), Lehrer (1986) and Vos (1999) will be briefly discussed, all of which are situated in the transformational-generative framework. Cognitive and functional accounts of SN- and TN-expressions will be discussed in Chapter 2.

The literature survey will be organized thematically rather than purely chronologically. Studies will be grouped together on the basis of shared general approach and methodology, e.g. corpus-based or introspective, or theoretical framework, e.g. functional or formalist. In each case the proposed structural and semantic analyses of SN-constructions will be discussed, as well as any mention of quantifying function. This status quaestionis will make clear that the literature so far makes for a rather fragmented point of departure, lacking explanation of the multi-layered polysemy of functions attested by SN- and TN-constructions in corpus data (see examples (1.1) to (1.4) and (1.9) to (1.42) above) and mostly treats them as intractable material. Such gaps and inaccuracies in the literature reveal the need for a systematic and comprehensive description of SN-constructions as well as a dynamic interpretation of NP-structure. These will be presented in Chapters 2 and 3.

Traditional pedagogic grammars and general reference grammars tend to be class-based or bottom-up, i.e. they work their way up in grammatical structure, starting from the description of word classes. Traditional grammars identify what they alternatively call "quantifying nouns" (Biber et al. 1999: 252) or "measure partitive nouns" (Quirk et al. 1985: 251) as belonging to the class of nouns, but nouns with a special or incongruent function, sometimes referred to as *individualization*. SNs are hence not related to the quantifying function within the NP, but are treated as marginal nouns or at most colloquially restricted alternatives to the regular quantifiers.

Bottom-up grammars are generally at a loss with regard to SNs, which seem to slip through the word class approach in a rather unpredictable way. A case in point of this is found in how they treat conflicting principles of subject-verb concord. In these accounts the SN is by default considered to be the head of the binominal NP. Verb concord is nevertheless noted to fluctuate, in the sense that the finite verb does not always display agreement with the grammatical number of the SN, as in *A heap of people are aware of it*. This is then explained as a conflict between strict grammatical concord and notional concord or proximity concord, e.g. Quirk et al. (1985: 757-765). The element determining concord is still considered to be the head, i.e. the SN, but different, i.e. semantic, aspects of this head determine the number of the verb rather than grammatical number, e.g. the sense of unity and plurality in *heap*. Note that the possibility of another element in the NP being the head is not really considered. Only in proximity concord is another element than the presumed head allowed to control the number of the verb, because of its proximity to the verb, but not in any systematic way. The account in terms of conflicting types of concord is very much an a posteriori account that explains with hindsight why verb concord is the way it is. It does not help language users to predict verb concord by offering criteria on which type of concord wins out. It essentially fails to see

fluctuating verb concord as a symptom of langue change, rather than a grammatical mistake or figure of speech, and therefore does not accurately assess the impact of SNs on NP and clause structure.

Both the Quirk grammars and the older descriptive ones mostly limit their observations to the more restricted set of idiomatic measure noun expressions, such as *a loaf of bread*, *a pack of wolves* and *an acre of land*. Only Kruisinga (1925/1932) has some interesting and useful observations on the specific NP structure of SN-constructions, relating it to the conceptual semantics of *of* (see Section 1.2.1.1). In other accounts, such as Biber et al. (1999), SNs are merely classified into smaller subsets depending on the source semantics of the SN, e.g. "container", "shape" and "standardized measure terms" (Biber et al 1999: 252-254).

All of this makes for rather fragmentary accounts that do not address the perceived incongruity in terms of the construction's inherently dynamic semantics. Variable subject-finite concord is not linked up with synchronic variation and/or a diachronic shift in the status of SNs. Of course one has to keep in mind that all of the reference works reviewed in this section aim at providing a comprehensive description of the grammar of English and this aim for comprehensiveness naturally leads to less depth in favour of breadth of coverage.

1.2.1.1 Jespersen (1932/1970), Kruisinga (1925/1932) and Poutsma (1928)

The older descriptive grammars by Kruisinga, Poutsma and Jespersen are wonderfully descriptive in their observations of all kinds of patterns and curiosities in the English language, but they are not strongly geared towards functional or explanatory generalizations. Jespersen and Kruisinga both describe SNs as a means of quantifying "mass-words" or "uncountables", called "individualization" (Jespersen 1932: 117-125 and Kruisinga 1925: 33). Jespersen discusses SNs in a section on types of nouns, whereas Kruisinga first brings them up in a section on numeratives.

Jespersen's and Kruisinga's remarks are restricted to the set of collocationally restricted measure nouns which individuate specific N2s, e.g. *a loaf of bread* (instead of *a bread*). Kruisinga (1925: 33) in addition notes that some SNs "have retained more of their independent meaning" than others, as illustrated by his examples: *A little pair of scissors* versus *a flight of steps*. He also notes that these kinds of expressions occur in front of plural nouns, as well as uncount nouns. Jespersen explains incongruous verb concord in SN-constructions as a conflict between grammatical concord and attraction (i.e. proximity concord) (Jespersen 1932: 179).

What distinguishes Kruisinga from Jespersen and even some of the more modern linguists is that he observes a specific structural versatility in

of when it features in N *of* N-patterns, such as TN and SN-constructions. This versatility is moreover related to a diachronic dimension (Kruisinga 1925: 396). In such patterns *of* can either make the noun preceding it or the following noun into an adjunct, i.e. either noun can be subordinated (ibid.: 391-395). He connects this with the semantic subordination of the noun in question and with the specific behaviour of the article and adjectives in such binominal noun phrases. The structural versatility of *of* in such patterns also translates into versatile concord patterns. Kruisinga, however, unlike Jespersen, does not resort to conflicting concord principles, but explicitly states that the noun following *of* sometimes determines concord (ibid.: 306). This is accounted for by the statement that "what is formally the adjunct is in thought the dominant member" as in *There was heaps of time* (example from Waugh's *Loom of Youth* cited in Kruisinga 1925: 306). However, no systematic indications are provided for when which element determines concord. Hence in a way one can look at this account as a variation on notional concord conflicting with strict grammatical concord.

1.2.1.2 Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik (1972/1985) and Biber, Johansson and Leech (1999)

Both Quirk et al. (1972) and (1985) are general reference grammars in the true sense of the word. Despite some influence from Hallidayan systemic-functional grammar, the Quirk grammars do not start from the demarcation of functional zones in the NP, such as determination, modification and categorization, in order to work their way down to the word classes that can express these functions. Instead they primarily use the basic constituents of the NP to structure the grammatical and other information they provide. The Quirk grammars hence mainly define and describe word classes.

SNs and TNs first appear in the chapter on nouns and determiners. SNs, and numerals in general, are characterized as incongruent members of both the noun category and the quantifier category (Quirk et al. 1985: 73). This incongruent function is called "partition", i.e. a means to achieve "the expression of quantity and thus countability" of uncountables such as mass nouns (cf. "individuation"). SNs and TNs are furthermore treated together as "partition expressions", with SNs expressing "partition in respect of quantity" and TNs in terms of quality. For this function SNs and TNs appear in "partitive constructions" (ibid.: 249) and SNs are further subdivided into general partitive nouns (e.g. *a piece of cake*), typical partitive nouns (e.g. *a loaf of bread/a speck of dus*t) and measure partitive nouns (e.g. *an acre of land*), ranging respectively from collocationally unrestricted over collocationally restricted expressions to standardized measures in terms of length, area, volume and weight (ibid.: 249-251). The SNs focused on in

the present study are also brought up in a section on open-class quantifiers such as *plenty of*, *a lot of* and *lots of* which are claimed to be used chiefly informally. *Heaps of* and *loads of* are said to be "roughly synonymous with *lots of*", but restricted to "familiar spoken English" (ibid.: 264 footnote). The head status of the latter two SN-expressions is not questioned. In fact, even for *plenty*, *lot* and *lots* head status is only cautiously questioned on the basis of the fluctuating verb concord they display. In the section on subject-verb concord, then, it again seems that Quirk et al. (1985) assume that these open-class quantifiers constitute the head of the NP, since divergence from concord with these open-class quantifiers is explained in terms of notional concord or proximity concord (i.e. "attraction") overriding strict grammatical concord. The possibility of the noun in the *of*-phrase constituting the head in at least some cases is not considered (ibid.: 764-765). Observations about fluctuating concord patterns or head status are moreover strictly synchronic.

Largely sharing the descriptive framework of the Quirk grammars is Biber et al. (1999), which explicitly presents itself as the data-based complement to the Quirk grammars. The corpus-based nature of the *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* translates largely into charting statistical differences in language use across regional varieties, such as American versus British English, or genres and registers, such as academic and conversational English (Biber et al. 1999: preface viii and Introduction p. 4).

Biber et al. (1999: 252) also approach the quantifier semantics of "quantifying nouns" as a means of expressing quantities of "uncountable nouns and plural countables" (cf. Kruisinga 1925). They add a classification of quantifying nouns in terms of their lexical source semantics, i.e. "nouns denoting type of container", e.g. *barrel of*; "nouns denoting shape", e.g. *heap of* and *wedge of*; "standardized measure terms", e.g. *gallon*; "plural numerals", e.g. *dozens*; and "nouns denoting large quantities", e.g. *a load of*, *loads of*, *a mass of* and *masses of*. Quantifying collective nouns, such as *bunch of, clump of, pack of* and unit nouns such as *bit of, piece of, loaf of* and *scrap of*, discussed before the quantifying nouns as such, are said to be special cases of quantifying nouns used with count nouns and uncount nouns respectively (Biber et al. 1999: 252-254);[10] a dichotomy that is contradicted in at least one direction by the corpus data in Chapter 4, in which *a bunch of legalese/practicing/time* for instance are attested.[11]

Most quantifying nouns are said to have specific collocates, such as *a loaf of bread*, while others are noted to have "a more general or metaphorical use" (Biber et al. 1999: 249). In terms of corpus findings this is reflected in lists of frequent collocations for all types of quantifying nouns. In some cases, e.g. *bunch of*, this gives rise to twin lists as with *bunch of daffodils/grapes/bananas* versus *bunch of idiots/amateurs/perverts*, but this

collocational variation is not accounted for in terms of a change in the status of SNs, even though the two lists clearly reflect head use collocates on the one hand and quantifier collocates on the other. Only one quantifying noun is said to act like an emergent "quantifying determiner" (i.e. a quantifier), namely *loads of*, because it systematically displays the same type of subject-verb concord as true quantifiers. Other than that Biber et al. (1999: 250) only alert the reader to "[n]ote the similarity with forms such as *a number of* and *a couple of* which are treated as quantifying determiners". In addition to these two a set of quantifiers with *of* are also described as "a novelty" and further includes *a (great) deal of, plenty of*, *a lot of* and *lots of* (ibid.: 277), but not *loads of* or *heaps of* or any of the other SN-expressions of the present study.

The main arguments attributed by Biber et al. (1999) in favour of noun status of most quantifying nouns are that they still have both a singular and a plural form and allow for adjectival modification, as in *great bunches of dried herb.* Nevertheless, Biber et al. (1999: 250, 252, 257) are aware of the fact that even core quantifiers still allow for premodification in certain contexts, e.g. *a select few*, and that *a lot of* and *lots of* have retained the singular/plural contrast as well. The quantifying nouns are hence claimed to lack decategorialization, i.e. the loss of properties typically associated with a more lexical category, such as the noun class, in processes of grammaticalization (See Section 3.4.3).

Quantifying nouns are associated with fluctuating verb concord and are in this context related to "species nouns", i.e. TNs, because they "are found in patterns which are superficially like those of quantifying nouns" (Biber et al. 1999: 255; see Section 1.2.2.1). As in the Quirk grammars and other reference works discussed earlier, head noun status of SNs and TNs is considered to be the default. Even though Biber et al. (1999) devote a separate section to the specific problem of identifying the head in quantifying noun phrases, the choice between verb concord with the SN or the noun in the *of*-phrase is, rather unhelpfully, concluded to depend "upon circumstances" (ibid.: 257). Only general tendencies of verb concord for certain groups of quantifying nouns are pointed out, but these do not explain the fluctuation in terms of an actual shift in the status of the SNs.

Corpus-based Biber et al. (1999) do not provide frequency counts of this variation in verb concord, but do include information about the distribution of the various species nouns and some quantifying nouns across different registers and genres (ibid.: 255-256).

1.2.1.3 Transformational-generative approaches to SN-expressions

This section reviews the main analyses of SN-constructions offered in early transformational approaches. Transformational-generative grammar has spent considerable attention to the issue of SN-structures and the problem of determining the head of such syntagms. These are very theory-specific studies, which point out interesting questions and often syntactically well-argued analyses. Nevertheless, they fall short in describing the dynamicity of SN-structures compared to functional accounts.

In early transformational grammar considerable attention was devoted to SN-expressions as part of a larger set of (determiner) N + *of* + (determiner) N-syntagms, which subsumed, besides SNs, structures such as, *A review of a new book about cooking*, *A photograph of a man with three arms*, as well as collective noun expressions, e.g. *a herd of* and *a family of*, and sometimes TN-expressions, such as *kind of* (Akmajian and Lehrer 1976: 109, Lehrer 1986: 395-396 and Jackendoff 1981). SNs are primarily analyzed within partitive constructions, i.e. "with a definite *of*-phrase", e.g. *many of the men*. Structures like *A bunch of men* are called "pseudo-partitives" (Jackendoff 1981: 106 and 119; compare Vos 1999). Overall SN-constructions are presented as "riddled with idiosyncrasies" that form possible counterexamples or exceptions to "rule operations", such as prepositional phrase extraposition[12] (Jackendoff 1981: 103; cf. Akmajian and Lehrer 1976, Selkirk 1977 and Lehrer 1986). This is mostly related to another observed structural peculiarity, namely the problem of determining the head of an NP, which, incidentally, is also the title of Akmajian and Lehrer's (1976) article on the subject of SNs. In addition transformational accounts have difficulties with assessing the value of *of* in these structures.

This section will focus on reviewing the historically central analyses offered by Chomsky and Jackendoff, as summarized by Langacker (1991: 87), while also referring to additional articles of the same authors and Selkirk (1977), as well as the more semantically-oriented account of Akmajian and Lehrer (1976) and Lehrer (1986). Whereas Jackendoff (1981) deals with SNs under the heading of "NP specifiers" and "group nouns", Akmajian and Lehrer (1976) refer to them as "NP-like quantifiers" and Lehrer (1986) as classifiers.

Up until Chomsky (1970) generativist accounts of a structure such as *several of the men* treated the noun following *of* as the head and everything before this final noun as a complex determiner, more specifically a pre-article and an article: [[*several of the*]$_{DET}$[*men*] $_N$] (cited by Jackendoff 1981: 103). In these accounts *of* is considered to be a more or less meaningless grammatical formative that does not add to the inherent constructional semantics of the structure, but is deleted or inserted transformationally depending on certain constraints (*of* is not even explicitly represented in the

tree diagram in Jackendoff 1981: 107). In this case *of* has to be inserted because of the definite article. (see Chomsky 1970, Jackendoff 1981: 107).

This analysis was untenable, also for Langacker (1991), if only for overlooking the fact that *the men* also is a constituent in *several of the men* and because of the disregard for *of*. This analysis was also rejected within transformational grammar, because it could not explain why extraposition of the *of*-phrase is possible in *Of the leftover turkey a lot has been eaten*, because it was not considered to be a constituent. The pre-article analysis was rejected in favour of the proposal made in Jackendoff (1968), who did recognize that the *of*-phrase functions as a kind of complement to the first noun, which is the head, but again treats *of* as a meaningless particle. *Several men* for instance is equated with *several of the men* by *of*-deletion. Cognitive Grammar, and Langacker (1991: 35) specifically, has always strongly objected to the postulation of meaninglessness for such elements of structure, since it violates one of its basic semiotic tenets that each grammatical structure has conceptual import, however abstract. Langacker (1991: 35 and 88 and further) hence argues that *of* does have specific semantic content and profiles an "intrinsic relationship between its trajector and landmark" (cf. Kruisinga 1925).

Nevertheless, Jackendoff (1981) keeps to the complement analysis as the most plausible one for "group nouns",[13] a category that subsumes a rather varied set of expressions with more grammatical and more lexical items, e.g. *a group of*, *a lot of*, *a bunch of, a number of,* but also narrowly-defined measure nouns such as *a gallon of, a pound of* (Jackendoff 1981: 107-108 and 119).

In conclusion, transformational accounts have proposed both head and non-head analyses for SN-constructions but they are all synchronic and of the *either/or*-type, in the sense that in each proposal only one analysis is offered for all SN-constructions (which, incidentally, is the opposite of what Halliday proposes: see Section 2.1.1). The two central analyses are not linked to each other in terms of diachronic developments (but see Akmajian and Lehrer 1976 for some exceptions). However, proposed constituency tests, such as the preposing of the *of*-phrase and preposition stranding, as well as testing selectional restrictions, etc. can be useful in the case studies, presented in Part 2 (see also Aarts 1998 with reference to Hudson 1987).

The structural and semantic dynamicity of SN-constructions hence seriously challenged early transformational generative grammar, which worked with a notion of NP structure that is detached from a functional organization of the NP and from the functions performed by that NP within a clause.

1.2.2 Discussions of TNs in the literature

The versatile behaviour of TNs already attracted the attention of the great descriptive grammarians of the first half of the 20th century such as Kruisinga and in the mid-to-late nineties they were commented on in readers or in the margins of chapters in historical grammars (e.g. Tabor 1993, Kay 1997, Denison 1998). As opposed to SNs, TN-expressions such as *sort of*, *kind of* and *type of* have also received considerable attention over the last few years in grammaticalization studies and have even become somewhat of a hot topic (e.g. Aijmer 2002, Denison 2002, Margerie 2010). The main focus of this recent body of studies is on qualifying uses, extended discourse marker uses of TNs and other subjectified meanings which differ most clearly from the head use. However, despite the number of articles and papers devoted to them, there is no agreement in the literature about a systematic, formally and functionally motivated classification of all the different uses of TNs, including NP-internal ones besides the head use.

In this section I will consider three basic grammatical classifications of TN-patterns which contribute essential insights: Kruisinga (1932), Denison (2002) and Aijmer (2002). These classifications complement each other in interesting ways, because they invoke partly different types of formal evidence and because each author points out patterns not necessarily considered by the others. As we will see, the NP-internal functions of TNs pose the greatest descriptive problems and have been covered least well. By contrast, the uses of TNs involving clear meaning shifts, for instance to qualifying uses (Denison 2002) and discourse particles, have already received much more attention and have been covered better. It is NP-internal functions of TNs that form the main focus of the present study, because these have been covered least well and also because it is the point at which TNs compare most to SNs. Part 2 will present a comprehensive corpus-based description with NP-internal functions as its main, though not exclusive, focus.

1.2.2.1 Discussions of TNs in general reference grammars

We have seen in the accounts of SN-constructions that TNs are often brought up in the same context as a variant instantiation of the N *of* N-scheme. Most general reference works as well as theoretically-oriented grammars do not go beyond noting that TNs can occur in the same structural patterns as SNs and that they display similar fluctuation in their verb concord patterns (e.g. Jespersen 1932: 117-125, Akmajian and Lehrer 1976: 109, Lehrer 1986: 395-396, Jackendoff 1981, Biber et al. 1999: 255-258, Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 333-334). TNs are alternatively re-

ferred to as "species nouns" or "varietal classifiers", or "SKT-nouns" in Biber et al 1999, Allan 1977, Keizer 2001 respectively. If any semantic distinction between SN- and TN-constructions is made, it mainly amounts to reference to quantity versus reference to type or quality respectively. This distinction is either dealt with in terms of two distinct types of "partition" (Quirk et al. 1985: 249 and 764-765) or in a more covert way (e.g. Jespersen 1932: 117-125, Biber et al. 1999: 255-258).

In the case of TNs not only verb concord comes into play, but also concord in number between the TN and the noun in the *of*-phrase, and between determiners in front of the TN and the TN itself (see Denison 2002/2005 in Section 1.2.2.2). Moreover, these types of concord interact. Quirk et al. (1985) point out what they call incongruous examples such as *These/Those sort/kind/type of parties are dangerous* and describe them as "an idiomatic anomaly". They provide rephrasal strategies, such as *Those kinds of parties are dangerous*, "to avoid the anomaly". The anomalous verb concord in the original structure is explained as "a more acceptable" instance of notional concord overriding grammatical concord (Quirk et al. 1985: 765-766). Just like SNs then, TNs seem to be elements of structure that deviate, in unpredictable ways, from some norm of default behaviour, which calls for a posteriori or ad hoc explanations.

The corpus-based *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (1999) is more accurate in its description of the incongruous concord patterns displayed by TN-constructions, because Biber et al. (1999) connect it with ambiguous head status of the TN. Nevertheless, in keeping with their descriptive manifesto perhaps, they refrain from making theoretical generalizations over such observations in terms of possible grammatical reanalysis of TNs. They use corpus data mainly to confirm regional and register preferences of the various TN-expressions (Biber et al. 1999: 256), as they also did for SN-expressions, for instance the fact that *sort of* is used more in British English while *kind of* is more typical of American English.

With regard to concord patterns, Biber et al. (1999: 255) note that normally there is agreement in number between the TN and the noun in the *of*-phrase, as well as between the determiner preceding the TN and the TN itself. However, there are also instances were a singular TN teams up with a plural noun in the *of*-phrase and vice versa. More important is the problem of incongruous concord between a plural determiner preceding a singular TN, where the determiner agrees in number with the noun in the *of*-phrase. This typically also entails incongruous verb concord with the noun in the *of*-phrase, as in *These kind of decisions are normally made by the teacher alone* (Biber et al. 1999: 255 and 258). In a subset of these cases the TN is what grammaticalization theory would call clearly delexicalizing and possibly grammaticalizing, e.g. *I hate these sort of things*, even though Biber et al. do not use these terms. They warily describe the phenomenon as a sub-

ordinate use of the species noun "in much the same way as a determiner". On other occasions TNs are vaguely described as having "a close relationship" with determiners (Biber et al. 1999: 256 and 258) (see Kruisinga in Section 1.2.1.1).

Based on corpus findings, Biber et al. (1999: 256) further note two kinds of extended functions for singular *sort of* and *kind of* "in conversation and fiction". Besides "serving the purposes of exact definition" "in academic prose", these TN-expressions can be used to "introduce greater vagueness", as in *It's a very difficult sort of situation*; *A silly sort of drink really*; *There's a kind of mystery here, wasn't there?*. In addition to this use, they can also be used "more generally as vagueness markers, or hedges", as in *I kind of danced into work* and *Yes, yes, it's sort of all a bit naked isn't it?*. In the latter two cases the species nouns are not regarded as nouns anymore, but hedges, though without any explanation in terms of grammaticalization or an explicit reanalysis claim (ibid.: 256-257). The corpus studies in Part 2 will make clear that this set of hedging uses as well as the set of singular TNs with plural determiner and plural noun in the *of*-phrase in fact subsume more types of grammaticalized TN-functions than observed in Biber et al. Can *There's a kind of mystery here* and *I kind of danced into work* be said to be semantically different, apart from the element over which they have scope? Is *It's a very difficult sort of situation* truly a vagueness marker, is it a head use of the TN, or is it yet another TN-use? Biber et al.'s distinctions do not provide clear answers to these questions and lack delicacy.

1.2.2.2 Denison (2002/2005) on SKT-patterns

Denison (2002/2005) offers a descriptive account of TN-constructions that does attempt to arrive at a more unified and grammar-based classification of the various kinds of TN-uses attested in actual corpus data. Denison's (2002) conference talks on "SKT patterns in present-day English" are presented "in an informal construction grammar framework" (Denison 2002: 1 and 2005: 1).[14] He posits two, or possibly three, basic constructions with *sort*, *kind* and *type of* in present-day English, and some "semi-conventionalised variants" (2002: 3) of these basic patterns, with the adverbial construction as the most important one. He also considers historical pathways of change, linking up the basic SKT patterns diachronically and thereby explaining their emergence in English grammar.

The three basic constructions, which are distinguished on the basis of clusters of syntactic, semantic, formal and discourse features (Denison 2002: 2), are represented in the following table (N1 refers to the TN and N2 to the noun following *of*):

Table 1.1: Denison's (2002: 3) classification of sort/kind/type of-constructions

	Semantic head	Discourse function	N1	N1 number	E.g.
Binominal	N1	Discourse topic or anaphor	*sort kind type*	sg. or pl.	*the sort of material*
Qualifying	N2	Hedge	*sort kind*	sg.	*A sort of holiday*
Postdeter-miner/ complex determiner	?	Anaphoric	*sort kind type*	sg.	*these sort of skills*

The first construction is called binominal because the TN functions as a full noun, which is the head of the noun phrase, while the *of*-phrase with N2 functions as a postmodifier to that head, e.g.

(1.54)   Collagen is the **sort** of material that is found already [...] in the dermis of the skin. (Denison 2002: 2)

According to Denison, N1 and N2 typically agree in number in this construction and premodification of N2 is rare (cf. Biber et al 1999 in Section 2.2.1). "Apparent premodification of N1 is really premodification of the whole construction" (Denison 2002: 2).

   In the qualifying construction, *sort* and *kind + of* form a unit which "qualifies", i.e. mitigates, the categorial meaning of N2 for ironic or other purposes, as in

(1.55)   But it I suppose it's as a that's as a **sort of** holiday, kind of doing you know doing nothing but sitting around (Denison 2002: 2)

According to Denison, only *kind* and *sort* (in their singular form) are used in this construction, while *type* does not appear in it. In the qualifying construction N2 is considered to be the head of the noun phrase.

   The postdeterminer or complex determiner construction has an uncertain status in Denison's current analysis, both in terms of its independence from the binominal and qualifying construction, and the status of the TN in it. It is distinguished mainly on the basis of number incongruence between a singular TN on the one hand, and a plural anaphoric determiner and plural N2 on the other, as in

(1.56)   I mean I don't associate you with uh you know one of **these sort of** skills like like driving. (Denison 2002: 3)

The construction is noted to be "common only in speech" (Denison 2002: 2). Denison leaves it open whether it is the TN or N2 that constitutes the head of the noun phrase in postdeterminer constructions. More fundamentally, he raises the question of whether this really is a distinct third pattern, or merely a reanalysis of the binominal construction with singular N1+*of*+plural N2. It is also said to bear resemblances to both of the previously described basic SKT-constructions (Denison 2002: 2 and 11).

    The additional "semi-conventionalised" patterns identified by Denison are viewed as intrinsically variants of the basic constructions. Two of these are particularly productive. Firstly, there are several variants of the qualifying structure, in which there is no N2 and in which the *sort/kind of* string modifies adjectives or verbs and sometimes adverbs or prepositions instead of nouns, as in

(1.57)   I **sort of** saw his point. (Denison 2002: 3)

Denison calls this the adverbial construction. The adverbial use of sort of has also given rise to a semantically bleached discourse marker use, as in

(1.58)   As I remember it used to be **sort of** like fairly common for a Tuesday [...]. (Denison 2002: 4)

The meaning of this discourse marker use is similar to that of colloquial *like* in examples such as

(1.59)   I should have **like** just whipped up this amazing meal. (cited in Denison 2002: 4)

Example (1.58) shows that both discourse markers often occur together. Denison is again not sure whether this bleached construction is a separate construction or not (Denison 2002: 4).

    In addition to the adverbial construction, there is a second main "semi-conventionalised pattern" only found with *type (of)*, which Denison (2002: 4) refers to as the semi-suffix use, as illustrated in (1.60). In these uses the TN comes to function more or less as a qualifying suffix that attaches to a previous description:

(1.60)   what you're saying is we need multiple **type of**. I mean ideally we need a multiple **type** building [...] sorry a building with multiple **type** rooms. (cited in Denison 2002: 4)