

Book reviews

Bernd Heine & Tania Kuteva (2002) *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. xii + 387 pp.

Reviewed by Leena Kolehmainen and Meri Larjavaara

World Lexicon of Grammaticalization (henceforth: *WLG*) is a highly interesting work introducing a new format for presenting a research bibliography. This format has already been used in a previous version of the lexicon (Heine et al. 1993).¹ The scope of *WLG* goes beyond any standard scholarly bibliography: it constitutes a reference book compiled in dictionary format, summarizing the central findings of the grammaticalization research that has been flourishing for the last two or three decades. The authors of *WLG* are distinguished scholars in the field of grammaticalization.

WLG starts with an introduction that discusses the notion of grammaticalization and the central questions of the approach briefly and pithily. The next chapter “Grammatical Concepts Used in This Work“ presents the terminology the authors operate with in the dictionary entries. Furthermore, it calls the reader’s attention to some difficulties related to the presentation technique. The following chapter, the dictionary proper, which constitutes the main part of the book (290 pages), is labelled “Source-Target Lexicon.“ The chapter contains presentations of grammaticalization processes discovered by individual researchers. The presentations are organized in an entry format adapted from dictionaries. The headwords are grammaticalization clines, e.g. REFLEXIVE > PASSIVE, arranged in alphabetical order. The first item in the headword refers to the origin (source) of the grammaticalization cline, and the last item to the

¹ For some reason, it is not mentioned in *WLG* that Heine et al. (1993) can be considered as a first version of the lexicon; the authors just say (p. 11) that *WLG* differs from it in a number of ways.

grammaticalized target or the goal achieved as a result of the process. The dictionary part is followed by three distinct appendices. The first one is a “Source-Target List“ that repeats the headwords in the dictionary entries and allows an overview of the documented grammaticalization processes. Especially the second appendix is drawn up in a user-friendly way. It is labelled “Target-Source List,“ and it enables a converse perspective on specific grammaticalization processes, cf. PASSIVE < REFLEXIVE. The last appendix lists roughly 500 languages from which examples are cited in the dictionary entries. The work closes with an extensive bibliography that takes into account works and papers mentioned in the dictionary entries as well as some other relevant publications.

The structure of the dictionary entries in “Source-Target Lexicon“ is not homogeneous. This is due to the understandable fact that the research background of distinct linguistic items and grammaticalization clines varies. Every dictionary entry begins with a headword (cf. above) that captures a specific grammaticalization chain (or part of a chain). The developments described in the headwords differ from each other. Some headwords refer to processes in which a lexical concept develops to a grammatical concept, eg. EAR (body part) > LOCATIVE. On the other hand, some headwords describe how grammatical concepts may develop to more grammatical ones or to other grammatical concepts, cf. FUTURE > EPISTEMIC MODALITY or COMITATIVE > NP-AND [noun phrase-conjoining marker]. The development described in the headwords is more closely described in the dictionary entry. The change is—whenever possible—illustrated with one or more examples originating from genetically unrelated languages. The authors aim at illustrating both the source and the target category of a specific development. However, because of the lack of data this is not always possible. Most of the examples are glossed and accessible to readers not familiar with the language in question. The entries give references to relevant monographs or papers. Furthermore, they most often contain comments on e.g. the research status, the semantic motivation of the conceptual change, the genetic and areal distribution of the development, and the unidirectionality of the change. In many entries the authors give cross-references to other headwords and grammaticalization clines that constitute closely related developments. This practice is useful since the grammaticalization clines captured in the headwords may be part of a more comprehensive development, e.g. (‘body’, noun > reflexive marker >) ANTICAUSATIVE > PASSIVE.

The value of the book lies in the fact that it makes a wealth of grammaticalization data published in numerous papers and monographs easily accessible to the readers. According to the authors, the "Source-Target Lexicon" consists of more than 400 presentations of distinct grammaticalization clines. Furthermore, the possibility of polygrammaticalization is well documented and easily found in the lists. For instance, the concept ABLATIVE has given rise to seven distinct target concepts in the languages of the world: > (1) AGENT, > (2) COMPARATIVE, > (3) MATERIAL, > (4) PARTITIVE, > (5) NEAR PAST, > (6) A[tributive]-POSSESSIVE, and > (7) SINCE (TEMPORAL).

Some of the solutions offered, however, are open to a number of critical remarks. Not all entries seem to attest equally representative instances of grammaticalization. For instance, the change BAD > INTENSIFIER is illustrated with the German adjective *furchtbar*, cf. *Das ist furchtbar* vs. *Der Pudding schmeckt furchtbar gut*. It is not immediately obvious to us whether this constitutes a good example of grammaticalization or rather of semantic change without the establishment of a new grammatical item. The borderline between grammaticalization and semantic change, or alternatively the one between grammaticalization and lexicalization, is not an easy issue, and similar questions have repeatedly been raised among other researchers (cf. e.g. Wischer 1997). These discussable entries are fairly numerous in *WLG*: we might mention the rise of singular honorific personal pronouns which have their origin in plural pronouns (English *you*, etc.), or the cline TRUE > INTENSIFIER (as *ko* in Baka: 'truly, really' > 'very'). As to the latter process, the authors ask for more research "on [its] exact nature": to us, it seems like a simple semantic process which we would not have included in the lexicon.

In addition, a few organizing solutions were unexpected. Some of the entries would have gained if they had been in somewhat more extensive groups. For example, if numerous nouns referring to body parts may develop to express deictic location, it could have been more useful to mention this in one entry instead of listing them separately (LIVER, BREAST, EAR, etc). In fact, some of the entries seem to be definitely too specific (e.g. BRANCH > CLASSIFIER). This is of course a choice made by the authors, and it certainly is the case that avoiding generalizations may prove useful for some purposes.

A more serious critical remark concerns the labels in the dictionary headwords. According to the authors, the labels are kinds of "concepts" (in

a pre-theoretical sense) that refer rather to semantic-functional than morphological-syntactic categories. This means that regular grammatical terms do not necessarily occur in the headwords. The technique partly complicates flexible use of the lexicon and does not make it easy to find e.g. information about the development of particular grammatical categories such as adposition and affix that nevertheless are used in the descriptions of the lexicon entries. A subject index consisting of such grammatical terms with cross-references to the corresponding dictionary entries could have facilitated the use of the lexicon.

Another difficulty originating from the lexicon format and the headwords chosen is the lack of considering constructions instead of particular "concepts," as they are called in *WLG*. For instance, the French *venir de* + infinitive construction is mentioned under the label ABLATIVE > NEAR PAST. It is difficult to agree with the view that it would be solely the ablative that contributes to the grammaticalization process in question. We do not think this is the authors' intention, and in fact they discuss the problem in the introduction (p. 7), but the presentation is nevertheless infelicitous: the chosen technique can easily lead to confusion or even misunderstanding when the reader is not familiar with the language in question.

When describing grammaticalization clines and listing references, *WLG* enables the reader to find relevant studies on a specific subject. However, very often the references cited are not primary sources but papers citing other studies. Thus *WLG* offers but a first step for bibliographical research. For example, it seems that Laury (1997) and Huumo (1999) are the only primary or empirical studies mentioned dealing with Finnish. Of course, this is partly due to the fact that most of the grammaticalization studies on Finnish are written in Finnish. Furthermore, it is clear that it would have been a never-ending task to look for primary sources in every case. Still, it is somewhat deceiving not to see the primary studies cited. It is true that even more generally *WLG* is mainly based on studies by the most famous members of the grammaticalization community (e.g. as regards the perfective in Modern French, the reference given is Bybee et al. 1994).

WLG is an important contribution to the study of the development of linguistic meaning and form. The relevant empirical data is easily accessible, and it inspires comparisons with similar or different developments in other languages familiar to the reader. The work will certainly be regularly used by students and researchers. It will prove itself

to be especially rewarding for professors and lecturers trying to find subjects for seminars and master's theses.

References

- Bybee, Joan L., William Pagliuca and Revere D. Perkins (1994): *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Tom Güldemann, Christa Kilian-Hatz, Donald A. Lessau, Heinz Roberg, Mathias Schladt and Thomas Stolz (1993): Conceptual Shift: A lexicon of grammaticalization processes in African languages, *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 34/35, Institut für Afrikanistik, Universität zu Köln.
- Huomo, Tuomas (1999): *Multi-layered grammaticalization: A study of the Finnish partitive*. Paper presented at the international conference New Reflections on Grammaticalization, Potsdam, Germany, 17–19 July 1999.
- Laury, Ritva (1997): *Demonstratives in interaction: The emergence of a definite article in Finnish*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wischer, Ilse (1997): Lexikalisierung versus Grammatikalisierung – Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede. *Papiere zur Linguistik* 57, Heft 2, pp. 121–134.

Contact information:

Leena Kolehmainen
 Department of German
 P.O. Box 24
 FIN-00014 University of Helsinki
 E-mail: leena.kolehmainen@helsinki.fi

Meri Larjavaara
 Department of French
 School of Modern Languages and Translation Studies
 FIN-33014 University of Tampere
 E-mail: meri.larjavaara@uta.fi