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Grammaticalization, the historical emergence of new items with grammatical function from earlier lexical items, is generally considered to be a unidirectional process. Much recent interest has, however, focused on degrammaticalization changes that run counter to this general direction. This paper considers three cases of degrammaticalization from Bulgarian and Welsh, involving shifts from pronoun to noun, and from preposition to verb. These cases exhibit a common set of properties, such as the central role played by syntactic reanalysis and pragmatic inferencing, that justify viewing them as examples of a new type of degrammaticalization. Degrammaticalization via syntactic reanalysis appears to be cross-linguistically rare, because it is constrained by two factors: the requirement that the item undergoing degrammaticalization should have become grammatically or semantically isolated; and the requirement that it should match a possible morphological pattern for the lexical category that it is to join.

1 GRAMMATICALIZATION AND DEGRAMMATICALIZATION

Central to the standard account of grammaticalization is the idea that it is a unidirectional process. Lexical items may over time acquire a grammatical function, and items with a less grammatical function may acquire a more grammatical function, but not the reverse. However, much recent research has been concerned with challenging this orthodoxy, both by claiming the existence of extensive counterexamples to unidirectionality (Janda 2001), and by claiming that grammaticalization itself is not a unified or explanatory process, but rather a frequent constellation of independent processes (Campbell 2001; Newmeyer 2001). This paper considers the existing typology of degrammaticalizations. It begins by asking what a convincing example of degrammaticalization would look like, and proposing a typology of the existing case of degrammaticalization discussed in the literature. In the process, it concludes that at least one, morphological lexicalization, is of little interest to historical linguists. Rather the interesting cases of degrammaticalization all involve reanalysis of some sort or another. Of the existing types of degrammaticalization proposed in the literature, the most convincing category is that where former clitics or bound morphemes acquire greater positional freedom (‘deflexion’). This paper suggests that another type can be identified at the syntactic level. In this type, grammatical items undergo syntactic reanalysis as lexical items.

1.1 Defining unidirectionality

Before looking at individual types of degrammaticalization, we need to decide exactly what sort of cases would count as degrammaticalization. It has often been noted that,
under the strictest definition, grammaticalization is unidirectional by definition, rather in the way that Neogrammarian sound change is by definition regular. A change of an item from lexical to grammatical is grammaticalization, and a change from grammatical to lexical is not, hence grammaticalization always proceeds in the direction lexical to grammatical (Campbell 2001: 124–127). The only falsifiable claim is not that grammaticalization itself is unidirectional, but rather that grammaticalization exists in the absence of a parallel reverse phenomenon, degrammaticalization, which, if it were attested, would occur when items with a formerly exclusively grammatical function changed into items with a (more) lexical function.

Even this second hypothesis is not as testable as might first appear, because there is relatively little agreement about what conditions a change has to fulfil in order to count as a convincing example of degrammaticalization. This paper takes the view that, in order to be theoretically interesting, degrammaticalization must be parallel to and linked to grammaticalization. That is, the nature of the mechanisms involved must, in some sense, be the same in both cases, but they must lead to opposite results. The existing cases of degrammaticalization fall into a small number of broad categories. These cases are considered individually below. Some cases involve mechanisms that are so completely unconnected with any of the processes that contribute to grammaticalization that they have little relevance for issues in grammaticalization. Others have a better claim to involve the reversal of grammaticalization.

Grammaticalization has been argued to operate at phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic-pragmatic levels. At a phonological level, grammaticalized items may undergo phonological erosion. At a morphosyntactic level, there is reanalysis, typically either reanalysis of boundaries (Hopper & Traugott 1993: 40–42, 48–50), for instance, word boundaries become stem-affix boundaries, or reanalysis of category (Hopper & Traugott 1993: 103–113), for instance, from verb to preposition.1

The semantic-pragmatic processes that have been identified as forming part of grammaticalization are metaphor and metonymy, and, in particular, pragmatic inferencing (Traugott & König 1991). For degrammaticalization to constitute a challenge to grammaticalization theory, it needs to be ‘grammaticalization in reverse’. That is, some (or all) of the processes that contribute to grammaticalization must be at work, but must lead to the opposite result from that expected in grammaticalization. The following five putative processes, which lead to the reverse outcome from that normally found in grammaticalization, might be posited as being involved:

(i) phonological ‘strengthening’;
(ii) boundary reanalysis rightwards along the cline: affix > clitic > independent word;
(iii) category reanalysis from grammatical (preposition, pronoun, article etc.) to (more) lexical (noun, verb, adjective);
(iv) metaphorical shift from abstract to concrete (‘antimetaphor’);
(v) pragmatic inferencing from abstract to concrete.

Some authors (for instance, Haspelmath 1998) have been sceptical of the role of reanalysis in grammaticalization. The orthodox position, however, seems to remain that “reanalysis is the most important mechanism for grammaticalization” (Hopper & Traugott 1993: 32).
Processes (ii), (iii) and (v), reanalysis and pragmatic inferencing are identical to those proposed in grammaticalization, but, in the proposed version of degrammaticalization, lead to the reverse outcome. The two reanalysis processes, (ii) and (iii), would be the ones most central to the idea of degrammaticalization, since they involve a change of status of some element from a more grammatical status (more bound) or category (more functional) to a less grammatical status (less bound) or category (less functional). Processes (i) and (iv) cannot, by definition, be the same in grammaticalization and degrammaticalization: phonological weakening, which is proposed for grammaticalization, cannot, by definition, lead to an increase in phonological material; and metaphor, since it is, by definition, the expression of the abstract using linguistic material used to express the concrete, cannot, strictly speaking, lead to a change from abstract to concrete. If phonological weakening and metaphor were to result in the reverse outcome, they would have different names. For this reason, the list suggests ‘phonological strengthening’ as a process of phonological change that would lead to the reverse outcome from that found in grammaticalization; and ‘antimetaphor’ as a process of semantic change that would lead to the same type of reverse outcome. All of these outcomes have been judged impossible, although existing proposals for degrammaticalization have involved some of them.

The discussion below will show that, even given these strict requirements, several types of degrammaticalization can be identified. The two most important seem to be deflexion and syntactic lexicalization. The next section considers a number of major proposed types of degrammaticalization, measuring them against the criteria for being ‘grammaticalization in reverse’.

1.2 Typologies of degrammaticalization

Norde (2001: 231–232) notes that most proposed instances of reversals of grammaticalization fall into one of two types, which she refers to as lexicalization of grammatical items and degrammaticalization / deflexion. Since the term degrammaticalization is already well-established in the literature for any change posited to be counter to the general direction of grammaticalization, I shall depart from her terminology in order to keep degrammaticalization as an overarching and essentially pretheoretical term, but her basic distinction is kept in what follows. Much the same typology of degrammaticalization is effectively implicit in other work in the field (for instance, Newmeyer 2001, Börjars 2003). I first consider these two types in terms of the criteria for being ‘grammaticalization in reverse’, accepting the first, but rejecting the second, before looking at two other possible types explicit or implicit in the literature, degrammaticalization of modals and syntactic reanalysis.

1.2.1 Deflexion

Perhaps most disturbing for the claim of unidirectionality are cases where bound inflectional affixes or clitics become free morphemes of some kind (either clitics or......
independent phonological words), gaining a greater degree of positional freedom in the process. That is, whereas grammaticalization represents change of an item’s status towards the right on the cline in (1), cases of degrammaticalization represent change towards the left:

(1)  free morpheme  >  clitic  >  affix

As such, they represent a case of boundary reanalysis ((iii) above), and, in fact, Janda (2001: 303) refers to this type of case as ‘upgrading via reanalysis’. Examples include the English possessive clitic ‘s from an earlier genitive case ending, the Irish first-person-plural pronoun *muid* from an earlier verbal inflection (Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994: 13–14; Doyle 2002), and the (older) Estonian question marker *es* from an earlier bound clitic (Campbell 1991). If the newly degrammaticalized item has the potential to bear stress, then examples of this type will also be cases of phonological strengthening ((i) above), on the assumption that a stress-bearing or optionally stress-bearing item is phonologically ‘stronger’ than one that can never bear stress. Although in some cases the empirical evidence in support of the change has been the subject of debate, the scenario itself seems clearly to amount in principle to degrammaticalization. Indeed, Haspelmath (2002) treats this as the only true type of degrammaticalization.

### 1.2.2 Lexicalization of grammatical items

A second group of proposed cases of degrammaticalization involves the formation of a lexical item directly from an independent grammatical item. Proposed cases of such a development include the shift of *down* from preposition (or adverb / particle) to verb (as in *He downed the beer in one*). These cases are sometimes referred to under the term lexicalization (Hopper & Traugott 1993: 127) or lexicalization of grammatical items (Norde 2001: 232). It seems reasonable to characterize lexicalization of grammatical items as essentially a process of derivational morphology, and therefore as inadmissible for being considered the ‘reverse of grammaticalization’. The English verb *to down* is derived by a process of zero-derivation (conversion) from a base that happens to be a preposition (or adverb / particle). In essence, this process is no different from the way in which verbs like *to boot (out), to sock (it), to head or to mother* are derived from bases which just happen to be nouns. In fact, the syntactic category of the base is irrelevant in present-day English. If it is correct that most of the degrammaticalized lexicalized verbs in English are of fairly recent provenance, then, historically, a productive morphological rule has been extended to a new environment, that is, rule extension has occurred: a morphological rule that once converted nouns and adjectives into verbs is now applied also to prepositions.

Lexicalization of grammatical items in English is paralleled by overt derivational morphological processes in other languages. For instance, in French and German, verbs derived from pronouns, French *tutoyer* < *tu, toi*, German *dizen* < *du* ‘to address using the familiar pronoun’; and French *vouvoyer* < *vous* + ending analogical to *tutoyer*, German *siezen* < *Sie* ‘to address using the polite pronoun’, have explicit morphology that distinguishes them from the corresponding pronouns. This demonstrates beyond any doubt that processes involved in grammaticalization (phonological erosion, reanalysis, and pragmatic inferencing) play no role at all here.

---

3 Norde (2001) argues for a very similar change having taken place in Swedish, but this is open to some dispute (see Börjars 2003).
particular, there is no plausible way in which reanalysis can have played a role, and there is no suggestion that any current or past instance of the form *down* is potentially ambiguous between a prepositional and a verbal analysis. Therefore, lexicalization of grammatical items is not ‘grammaticalization in reverse’ and is therefore not degrammaticalization. None of the five processes of degrammaticalization posited above is involved. It is rather an independent process of derivational morphology, hence purely of morphological change.

1.2.3 *Degrammaticalization of modals*

Another group of well-known examples does not fit into either of the types proposed so far. These are the cases of modal verbs becoming more lexical over time, either by replacing modal meanings with lexical ones or by adopting syntactic patterns associated with lexical verbs rather than auxiliaries. A number of examples of this have been proposed, for instance, the shift of Pennsylvania German *wotte* from auxiliary to lexical verb (Burridge 1998); the Swedish modal *må*; Latin *possē*; and English *need* and *dare* (Beths 1999). It is unclear whether to treat these as genuine examples of degrammaticalization. A number of authors (for instance, Börjars, Eythórrsson & Vincent 2003) have suggested that, in some of these cases, the shift towards lexical uses has its basis in the survival of an earlier pre-grammaticalization lexical use. That is, a lexical item *A* develops a grammaticalized form *B* (*A > A* and *B*); the lexical form survives, and, at some later point, the grammaticalized form becomes obsolete (*A* and *B* > *A*) (cf. Haspelmath’s ‘retraction’, Haspelmath 2002). Clearly the fact that functional items sometimes become obsolete is not part of any theory of grammaticalization. To the extent that this scenario is the correct one for these cases, they do not represent true degrammaticalization. I therefore leave open the question of whether this type of drift backwards needs to be recognized as a distinct type of degrammaticalization.

1.2.4 *Syntactic lexicalization: A new type of degrammaticalization?*

There is another type of degrammaticalization that has received little attention in the literature, but which seems to involve category reanalysis and pragmatic inferencing (processes (iii) and (v) above). It is to these cases that much of the rest of this article is devoted. I shall argue that these cases really are ‘grammaticalization in reverse’. This is not to be understood in the sense that a particular linguistic item with a grammatical function returns to the SAME form and function that it formerly had as a lexical item. This is clearly either impossible – unless languages have memories – or else likely to arise only by pure chance. Just as with lexicalization of grammatical items, these are cases where a lexical category (noun or verb) derives historically from an earlier grammatical category (preposition or pronoun). However, in sharp contrast to lexicalization of grammatical items, processes of derivational morphology, which are not involved in grammaticalization, are not involved in these cases of degrammaticalization either. The three main examples to be discussed in more detail below are:

(i) Bulgarian *nešto* ‘thing (noun)’ < ‘something, anything (indefinite pronoun)’

---

4 Hopper & Traugott (1993: 49) do view examples of this kind as instances of reanalysis, but this ignores the cross-linguistic evidence, and the possibility of making a distinction between morphological zero-derivation and reanalysis.
Superficially these look like the same type of example as lexicalization above. However, although they involve the same sorts of category shift, for instance preposition to lexical verb, the cases considered here have a very different flavour, in that they involve a demonstrable continuity between the old and the new function, with the new function arising out of reanalysis of ambiguous instances of the old function. For this reason, I shall refer to them as ‘syntactic lexicalization’.

Of the existing cases of degrammaticalization described in the literature, one group has a good claim to belong in this category. In a number of Germanic languages, there are cases of the degrammaticalization of particles in separable verb construction into adjectives. Examples are the degrammaticalization of German zu from preposition ‘to’ to become an (attributive) adjective ‘closed’ (Janda 2001: 299–300), or the degrammaticalization of Dutch bij from a preposition ‘by’ to an adjective ‘smart, tough, alert’ (Perridon 2003). These involve syntactic lexicalization provided that they arose through a category reanalysis based on potentially ambiguous environments. Janda suggests that the first example arose through successive stages beginning with sentences of the kind die Tür ist zugemacht ‘the door is closed’ with elision of the verb to die Tür ist zu ‘the door is closed (lit. to, preposition)’. This is open to reanalysis since the syntactic frame is the same as that for an adjective die Tür ist blau ‘the door is blue’. It might be added that even the elision does not need to be postulated because sentences like Er machte die Tür zu ‘He closed the door’ could be construed as having a structure with zu as an adjective, parallel to the adjective kürzer ‘shorter’ in such sentences as Er machte die Hose kürzer ‘He made the trousers shorter; he shortened the trousers’. Either way, what is actually a preposition can plausibly be interpreted as an adjective in certain syntactic environments, and is reanalyzed as such, giving rise to fully adjectival uses, for instance, in attributive position, as in die zu((e)n)e Tür ‘the closed (adjective) door’. In as much as this scenario reflects the actual emergence of these adjectives, the process involved is indeed syntactic lexicalization.\footnote{If this sketch of the historical development is correct, then zu and parallel cases belong in a distinct category from cases of preposition to verb in English (such as to down, to out or to off), contra Janda (2001: 299). The former are syntactic lexicalizations, whereas the latter are lexicalizations of grammatical items.}

Notice that in all of these cases, one form of the degrammaticalized lexical item is identical to the grammatical item from which it arose. This seems to be a requirement of syntactic lexicalization, since it is only if this requirement is met that the syntactic ambiguity underlying the reanalysis, and necessary for it, can arise. Contrast this with morphological lexicalization, where this condition need not be met. For instance, the German verb duzen has no morphological form that is identical to the pronoun du. Note that from this it follows that Germanic-style reanalysis of prepositions as adjectives could only occur as syntactic lexicalization in a language where adjectives lack an overt ending in at least one form or syntactic environment.

1.2.5 Evaluation of the typology of degrammaticalization
In this section, I have divided the most plausible types of degrammaticalization into four types: (i) deflexion; (ii) lexicalization of grammatical items; (iii) degrammaticalization of modals; and (iv) syntactic lexicalization. I have taken it as self-
evident that the most interesting cases of counterdirectional changes, and the ones for which the term ‘degrammaticalization’ seems most appropriate, are those which involve the same sorts of processes as core examples of grammaticalization, but with reverse outcomes. If so, then (ii) lexicalization of grammatical items can be dismissed. Degrammaticalization of modals is possible, but dubious, mainly for empirical reasons. This leaves deflexion and syntactic lexicalization as the central phenomena in degrammaticalization, and the ones to which historical linguists should pay most attention.

In the rest of this article, I demonstrate that syntactic lexicalization is indeed a credible scenario for degrammaticalization. If counterdirectional changes (degrammaticalizations) do exist, then the task of historical linguists is to account both for the existence of the two types of change, and for their relative (and unequal) frequencies. In discussing the various cases of syntactic lexicalization, I attempt to consider what unusual properties of the scenario lead to counterdirectional change.

2 CASES OF SYNTACTIC REANALYSIS AS DEGRAMMATICALIZATION

2.1 Bulgarian nešto ‘thing’ < ‘something (indefinite pronoun)’

Generic nouns such as ‘thing’ or ‘person’ frequently give rise historically to indefinite (unknown-specific) pronouns such as ‘someone’, ‘something’ or ‘somewhere’. Heine & Kuteva (2002: 208–209, 232–233, 295–296) recognize the following grammaticalization paths of this type:

(2) THING > INDEFINITE PRONOUN e.g. Nahuatl itlaa ‘thing’ > tlaa ‘something’;
    MAN > INDEFINITE PRONOUN e.g. Latin homo ‘man’ > French on ‘indefinite pronoun’;
    PERSON > INDEFINITE PRONOUN e.g. Albanian njeri ‘person’ > ‘somebody, anybody’.

This process seems to be a very common one. Indeed, Haspelmaph (1997: 182) notes that, in a sample of 100 languages, 42 had indefinite pronouns that can be derived from generic nouns. The diachronic process is quite straightforward. First, the generic noun is used without modifiers as a noun phrase to convey ‘someone’ or ‘something’ in sentences of the type ‘I saw a person’. Then it acquires phonological, morphological and syntactic features distinct from other nouns, in effect, becoming grammaticalized, with the nominal and pronominal uses diverging. Finally, the original generic noun may become obsolete in its former meaning, as with English body in somebody (no longer possible with the meaning ‘person’) or French rien ‘nothing’ (formerly ‘thing’) (Haspelmath 1997: 182–183).

In the light of this typical pattern, the history of Bulgarian nešto is particularly interesting, since it seems to instantiate exactly the reverse development, namely
INDEFINITE PRONOUN > THING. In Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) něčítō (genitive něčeso) is used as an indefinite pronoun meaning ‘something’.6

(3) a. Tūgdā pristīpī kū nenumati snovu zedēovu sū snīma then came.3S to him mother son.DAT Zebedee’s.DAT with sons.INST svoima klanējōštī sē i prosēštī něčeso otū her.INST bow.PRES.PART REFL and ask.PRES.PART something.GEN from him ‘Then the mother of the son of Zebedee came to him with her (two) sons, bowing down and asking something from him.’ (Mar. Matt. 20.20)
b. Simone imamū ti něčūto rešti… Simon have.PRES.1S you.DAT something say.INF ‘Simon, I have something to say to you…’ (Mar. Luke 7.40)

The semantic interpretation of examples such as those in (3) could perhaps be open to debate, but the morphosyntax of něčitō is clear and points unambiguously to a status distinct from that of a lexical noun. It is unlike nouns in having a highly irregular genitive form něčeso (exemplified in (3a)), not exactly paralleled by any noun or pronoun, except for the transparently related interrogative pronoun čětō ‘what’. Its syntactic behaviour is typical of indefinite pronouns in other languages. In particular, modification is highly constrained, essentially limited to modification by adjectives in the short (indefinite) form. This is illustrated in (4), and paralleled in the English translations ‘something else’ and ‘something evil’.

(4) a. mněaxq bo q zlata plīny sōště ili něč’to ino. think.IMPF.3P PRT it gold.GEN full be.PRES.PART or something else.NEUT ‘…for they thought it was full of gold or something else.’ (Supr. i.26v.19)
b. …živštii vū g’radē nadē’axq sě zīlo něč’to priěti. living in city were-sure.3P REFL evil.NEUT something receive.INF otū neju… from them.DUAL ‘…those living in the city expected to receive something evil from them…’ (Supr. i.106r.27)

Modification by the long (definite / specific) form of the adjective is not found in the canonical Old Church Slavonic texts.7 Haspelmith (1991: 107, 1997: 131–132), following Miklosich (1886: 214), derives Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) indefinite pronouns such as někūto ‘someone’ and něčitō ‘something’ historically from clauses such as ne vě kūto / čito ‘I don’t know who / what’ (sic, presumably for ne vě / věstī kūto / čito ‘he / she doesn’t

6 The relevant data are: Mar. Matt 20.20, Luke 7.40, 11.53, John 13.29; Supr. i.17v.20, i.26v.19, i.104r.12, i.105v.21, i.106r.27, iii.9v.29, iii.24v.3, iii.46r.25, iii.63r.7, iii.77v.29, iii.80v.12, iii.82r.9, plus examples in Kurz (1958–66: ii.453).

know who / what’ or *nevěmı / vědě küto / čito* ‘I don’t know who / what’ etc.) via grammaticalization paths of the kind ‘She told him I don’t know what’ > ‘She told him something’ with corresponding extreme phonological erosion (Haspelmath 1997: 143). Alternatively, it has been seen merely as a combination of the negative *ne* plus the interrogative pronoun *čito* ‘what’, with (somewhat mysterious) ‘affective’ secondary lengthening of the first vowel (Trubačev 1997: xxiv.92–93; see also Vasmer 1953: 209). Either way, it is clear that *něčito* is not related historically to a noun, and its use as an indefinite pronoun meaning ‘something’ is etymologically primary, and well established as its only function by the time of the earliest textual attestation.

In Modern Bulgarian, on the other hand, *nešto* functions both as a noun and as a pronoun. It has gained a number of morphosyntactic properties that identify it also as a neuter noun. It has a regular plural inflection in –*a*, and hosts forms of the clitic definite article, in both cases using forms identical to those of a neuter noun such as *mjasto* ‘place’ (including a shift of stress to the second syllable in the plural). The relevant forms are given in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘thing’</th>
<th>‘place’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sing. indef.</td>
<td>nešto</td>
<td>mjasto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plur. indef.</td>
<td>neštata</td>
<td>mesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sing. def.</td>
<td>neštoto</td>
<td>mjastoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plur. def.</td>
<td>neštata</td>
<td>mesta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Forms of *nešto* ‘thing’ and *mjasto* ‘place’ in Modern Bulgarian.

These morphosyntactic innovations are illustrated in the examples in (5).8

(5) a. Vratata beše razbita, no neštata v stajata bjaxa po mestata si.  
‘The door had been broken in, but the things in the room were in their (respective) places.’ (Rečnik na bǎlgarskija ezik 1123)

b. Točno tova e neštoto, koeto naj-mnogo drazni.  
‘That is exactly the thing that irritates the most.’

It occurs in syntactic frames typical of nouns, for instance, following a numeral, as in (6a), a quantifier, as in (6b), or a demonstrative, as in (6c).

(6) a. Stava vǎпрос, če imapet nešta, koito trjabva da se napravjat.  
‘The issue is that there are five things that need to be done.’

8 Unless otherwise indicated, example sentences are from the website of Bǎlgarska Nacionalna Televizija (www.bnt.bg).
b. Za vsički tezi nešta sa nužni vekove, a ne desetiletija.
   ‘Centuries are needed for all those things, not decades.’

c. …graždanite trjabva da znanja tova nešto.
   ‘The citizens need to know that thing.’

These properties are all innovations not found in Old Church Slavonic. It is also worth noting that there are a number of nouns derived from nešto in Modern Bulgarian, such as diminutives neštičko, neštinko, and neštice. It would be odd if such forms had been derived from a pronoun rather than from a fully lexical noun.

Alongside its use as a noun, nešto maintains its use as an indefinite pronoun, for instance, nešto drugo ‘anything else, something else’ or nešto novo ‘something new, anything new’, in which case any adjective follows. However, when used as a pronoun, nešto does not have a plural. Adding plural morphology to the latter phrases results in the formation of the ungrammatical *nešta drugi ‘somethings else’ and *nešta novi ‘somethings new’, with unacceptable ordering of adjectives. With adjectives, the distinction between the indefinite pronoun use of nešto and its use as a common lexical noun is particularly clear, contrast (7), with nominal nešto, and (8), with pronominal nešto.

(7) …vskako novo nešto e dobhe zabraveno staro.
   ‘…every new thing is a well-forgotten old one.’

(8) Predi dve godini xorata glasuvaxa sigurno za promjanata,
    iskajki nešto po-dobro.
    ‘Two years ago people voted decisively for change, wanting something better.’

Nešto, therefore, has split into two items in Modern Bulgarian. One, a noun meaning ‘thing’, has a full range of nominal morphosyntactic properties, and is an innovation. The other, an indefinite pronoun ‘something’, continues Old Church Slavonic něčito, and is much more restricted morphosyntactically. Furthermore, the emergence of a lexical noun from an indefinite pronoun is a change that runs counter to the general expectations of grammaticalization.

How has this happened? A scenario can be sketched out that is relatively similar to that proposed for grammaticalization. In some contexts, ‘something’, that is, some thing known to exist, but whose actual identity is not known to the speaker or hearer, may be interpreted as ‘a thing’, the identity of which is known to one or both participants. This ambiguity is already present in the examples in (3) and (4), in particular (4b), and is facilitated by the relatively free word order of Old Church Slavonic. Semantically, then, the shift is relatively easy to envisage at any time.

Morphosyntactically things are more changeable. Each new generation of speakers has to establish whether nešto is morphosyntactically a generic noun or an indefinite pronoun. Three facts seem relevant in making this decision. First, the nominative form nešto could be the nominal form of a neuter noun (with the ending –o), and, in fact, happens to parallel very closely the form of a real generic neuter noun mjasto ‘place’. Second, in Old Church Slavonic, něčito is transparently synchronically
related to the interrogative pronoun čito ‘what’. Third, the irregular genitive nečeso alerts the learner to the fact that this is no ordinary noun.

The first fact leads learners to posit that nešto is a generic noun. The second and third both lead learners to posit that nešto is an indefinite pronoun. In Old Church Slavonic, all three facts are relevant, and the indefinite pronoun analysis therefore ‘wins’. Independent developments in Bulgarian remove the second and third facts. The interrogative pronoun čito ‘what’ becomes obsolete and is replaced by kakvo, formerly ‘which one (neuter)’ (for details, see Ivanova-Mirčeva & Xaralampiev 1999: 114–115). In time, the erosion of the Bulgarian case system, in particular, the loss of genitive forms for nouns, makes the third fact redundant too. With these two gone, the hypothesis that nešto is a generic neuter noun rather than a pronoun becomes a highly attractive one. There is some (morphological) evidence for it, and no longer any non-negative evidence against it. Degrammaticalization of nešto as a generic pronoun results. This involves a counterdirectional metonymic semantic change, plus category reanalysis from pronoun to noun. Both of these are processes of types typically associated with the change of GENERIC NOUN > INDEFINITE PRONOUN, but lead to the reverse outcome.

2.2 Welsh eiddo ‘property’ < ‘his (possessive pronoun)’

A second case of this type of degrammaticalization comes from the history of Welsh, and again involves the emergence of a generic noun. In Modern Welsh, the word eiddo may be a noun, meaning ‘property’ in most varieties, or it may function as a masculine third-person singular possessive pronoun, meaning ‘his (one)’, where it forms part of a paradigm along with other possessive pronouns inflected for the person and number of the possessor, and, in the third person singular, the gender of the possessor. Use of the eiddo-paradigm as a possessive pronoun in Modern Welsh is rather formal, and it is replaced by various circumlocutions in spoken and less formal varieties. The nominal use is neutral with respect to register. The paradigm of the possessive series of pronouns is given for Middle and Modern Welsh in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle Welsh</th>
<th>Modern Welsh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>singular</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>meu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>teu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>eidaw (masc.) eidi (fem.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>einym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>einwch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Paradigm of possessive pronoun eiddaw / eiddo in Middle and Modern Welsh.

There is also of course a considerable amount of negative evidence, that is, the absence of various types of syntactic modification, and the absence of various morphological forms (especially plural ones). However, it is widely assumed that such negative evidence is only marginally taken into consideration in language acquisition.

The meaning ‘furniture’ is reported for the dialect of northern Ceredigion (R. J. Thomas 1950–2002: 1189).
The pronoun occurs with a preceding definite article if used in an argument position, and is optionally followed by a ‘reinforcing’ pronoun:

(9) ‘Rwy ‘n hoffi… ei gwmni a ‘i wlad yn well na ’r am PROG like.VN his company and his country PRD better than the eiddot ti.
yours you
‘I like… his company and his country better than yours.’ (Thorne 1993: 169)

The dual nominal-pronominal nature of eiddo in Modern Welsh is most clearly confirmed by the fact that it may be modified by adjectives, demonstratives and quantifiers, whereas other forms of the pronoun, such as the feminine third-person singular eiddi, cannot. This is shown in (10)–(12).

(10) a. eiddo lledrad / coll b. *eiddi lledrad / goll
EIDDO stolen lost EIDDI stolen lost
‘stolen / lost property’ ‘stolen / lost things of hers’

(11) a. yr eiddo hwn b. *yr eiddi hwn / hon / hyn
the EIDDO this.MASC the EIDDI this.MASC / FEM / PLUR
‘this property, these belongings’ ‘these things of hers’

(12) a. ei holl eiddo ef b. *ei holl eiddi hi
3SM.GEN all EIDDO 3SM 3SF.GEN all EIDDI 3SF
‘all his belongings’ ‘all her belongings’

If the nominal lexical use of eiddo can be shown to be a secondary innovation, then this amounts to degrammaticalization. The word’s etymology, taken together with syntactic and semantic evidence from Middle Welsh, can be used to piece together a historical development that leads via a number of stages away from a pronominal status to that of a lexical noun.

Etymologically eiddo is clearly pronominal in origin. It derives historically from the stressed form of the Common Celtic possessive adjective */esjo/ ‘his’, cognate with Sanskrit asya. Stressed */esjo/ gives */eið/ by regular phonological changes. Subsequently, Middle Welsh eidaw */eiðaw/ arises as a result of the addition of the ending /aw/ by analogy with the masculine third-person singular ending of inflected prepositions (see below). Unstressed */esjo/ gives rise to the Middle Welsh genitive pronominal clitic y /i/ ‘his, him’ (Modern Welsh ei) (Lewis & Pedersen 1937: 216).

If we compare the syntax of the eiddo-paradigm in Middle Welsh and Modern Welsh, we also observe a development in the direction of more lexical uses. Broadly speaking, eiddo-pronouns appear in three syntactic environments in Middle Welsh. In predicative positions, they occur alone, as in (13a), or with a following ‘reinforcing’ pronoun (glossed as 3SM in (13b)), or a noun phrase, as in (13c):
When they appear in argument positions, they must further be preceded by a definite article, but are otherwise parallel:

(14) a. Y guyr hynny… a ouynysant idaw, pa darpar oed yr eidaw…
the men these PRT ask.PAST.3P to-him what intent was the his
‘These men … asked him what his intent was.’ (PKM 32.22)

b. …ac y dodet emelltith Duw a ’r eidaw ynteu a
and PRT put.PAST.IMPERS curse God and the his 3SM and
‘…and the curse of God and his own and that of the whole of Wales was put
on anyone who might not keep it [the law]…’ (LIB 2.10–12)
most varieties of modern spoken Welsh, /ð/ is inserted in all the inflected forms of the preposition, making the resemblance with the reformed eiddo-paradigm even stronger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern literary Welsh</th>
<th>Modern spoken Welsh (King 1993: 280)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>singular</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>hebof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>hebot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>hebddo (m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hebddi (f.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Paradigm of second conjugation inflected preposition heb ‘without’ in Modern Welsh.

Old and Middle Welsh inflected prepositions allowed either overt or null objects. If the object was null, the ending of the preposition was sufficient to identify the person and number of the object unambiguously. The parallelism between inflected prepositions and possessive pronouns led to the pronouns being treated in the same way, as in (15). Rather than being the possessor itself, the pronoun was reanalyzed as merely a head that agreed with the possessor, which, being unambiguously identified by the ending of the pronoun, could be omitted.

(15) eiddo > eiddo (ef) on the analogy of hebddo (ef)

It is also worth pointing out that this brought eiddo more into line with the syntax of nominal possessor noun phrases such as llys Arthur ‘Arthur’s court’, where the possessor is overt and follows the head noun. This development is already complete by the time of the earliest records of Welsh, but can be inferred from the etymology of the eiddo-paradigm and the comparative evidence of the absence of overt possessors accompanying possessive pronouns in most other Indo-European languages.

Once pronominal possessors are permitted, the appearance of nominal possessors, that is, the pattern in (13c), is inevitable, but a difficulty arises with agreement. Inflected prepositions have an uninflected form for use with nominal objects (the form heb in the case of the example in Table 3). The possessive pronoun lacks such a form. Instead, we find the pronoun agreeing with its possessor. That is, in (13c), we find eidiu uy ryeni inheu with third-person-plural possessive pronoun eidiu agreeing with the third person plural possessor uy ryeni inheu ‘my parents’. This agreement runs counter to the way the syntax of prepositions works in Middle Welsh, since prepositions never agree with nominal objects. This may account for the unexpected rarity of the pattern in (13c) in Middle Welsh texts.

The scene is now set for degrammaticalization. The eiddo-paradigm is syntactically and semantically ambiguous in two contexts. First, when there is no overt possessor, the sequence definite article + eiddo is sometimes contextually vague, and some instances, such as that in (16), are open to being interpreted as referring to physical objects (‘the property’) rather than denoting the identity of the possessor.

\[12\] Morphological case plays no role in either instance, since neither Middle nor Modern Welsh has morphological case marking on nouns or independent pronouns.
(‘his’). Both semantic widening and narrowing are involved. In many cases, if something is ‘his’ it will also be a physical entity, hence also ‘property’ (narrowing). On the other hand, widening occurs if the notion of masculine third person singular is viewed as being only incidental, and contextually motivated.

(16) yauν yu caffael o perchnenauc e da er eydau ket
right is get.VN of owner the property the EIDDO although
give.PRES.SUBJ.IMPERS surety on-it
‘[if a man gives someone a surety of something which he does not own…] it is right for the owner of the property to have what is his [=‘the property’?] even though there is a surety on it…’

(17) …nyt eydav vn tewyssav[c] e vudvgolyaeth namyn e gwyr
NEG EIDDO one prince the victory but the men
a emlado trostvnt.
REL fight.PRES.SUBJ.3S for-them
‘…the victory is not a single prince’s [property?] but the men who fight for them.’ (LlI 39.16–17)

Secondly, constructions of the type in (13c), if the pronoun is third person singular masculine, will almost always be open to reanalysis of eiddo as a lexical noun. For instance, in (17), the phrase eydav vn tewyssav[c] is syntactically ambiguous. Welsh possessive noun phrases may never begin with a definite article even if they are definite (a ‘construct state’ effect), so, even if eydav were a noun, with the whole phrase meaning ‘the property of a single prince’, there would be no preceding definite article. Semantically, the distinction between ‘X’s’ and ‘X’s property’ will only be relevant if a physical object is possessed, and, even then, may be slight, as is also the case in (17).

The creation of a new lexical item eiddo ‘property’ is the result of both of these factors. The emergence of this new item is best confirmed by the appearance of sequences such as y eidaw (ef) ‘his property’, with a preceding possessive clitic y ‘his’ in the pattern found with other lexical nouns (cf. y lys (ef) ‘his court’). This pattern is illustrated in (18). Dictionaries treat this as an innovation dating from the fourteenth century (R. J. Thomas 1950–2002: 1189; and Lloyd-Jones 1931–63: i.454).

---

13 Both Lloyd-Jones (1931–63) and R. J. Thomas (1950–2002) take the second factor to be responsible for the change, but there are two reasons to doubt this. First, the pattern in (13c) and (17) is quite rare in Middle Welsh texts, so rare that it seems unlikely that it alone could lead to doubt over the categorial status of eiddo. Secondly, two other forms of the pronoun, namely first person singular meu and second person singular teu, also develop for a while into nouns meaning ‘property’, before becoming obsolete. With these, the first factor plays a role, but ambiguous sentences of the type found in (17) cannot be constructed.
‘Whenever a sergeant dies, his property is at the mercy of the lord.’ (LIB 29.1–2)

Notice also that, with (18), the task of conveying the possessor, previously encoded primarily in the pronoun *eiddo*, is ultimately transferred to the accompanying pronoun or lexical noun phrase. This transfer of function from one element to another element with which it habitually co-occurs is a phenomenon also found in grammaticalization (cf. the transfer of the value of negation to *pas* in French *ne ... pas* constructions).

To sum up, a lexical item meaning ‘property’ has an undisputed etymology based on a pronoun. The historical development from pronoun to noun can be partly reconstructed and partly documented historically as a series of semantic and analogical syntactic changes that lead to the gradual development of lexical properties. This is extremely surprising given a unidirectional view of grammaticalization.

### 2.3 Welsh *nôl ‘bring’ < *yn ôl ‘after (preposition)’

Our final case study is also from Welsh, but this time involves the emergence of a lexical verb from a preposition. Many varieties of present-day Welsh have a verb meaning ‘fetch’ that derives historically from a form of the Middle Welsh complex preposition *yn ol* ‘after’. The most widely distributed form of the verbnoun,\(^\text{14}\) found across the whole of north Wales, is *nôl*. Many southern varieties have another variant, *hôl* or *ôl*, while in the midlands ‘fetch’ is normally expressed using some other verb, such as *moyn*, or using a periphrasis. For the precise geographical distribution of the forms in the traditional dialects, see A. R. Thomas (1977: 534–535).

For this to be a case of degrammaticalization, it is necessary to demonstrate that *yn ol* in Middle Welsh does indeed behave like a preposition, and that *nôl* in the relevant varieties of present-day Welsh is a verb. We also need to demonstrate that the lexical verbal use and meaning arose from the preposition, and not, say, some historical remnant of an earlier lexical meaning. In fact, for the claim that this is ‘grammaticalization in reverse’, and therefore degrammaticalization, the details of the transition are crucial.

#### 2.3.1 The development of Middle Welsh *yn ol* as grammaticalization

First, consider Middle Welsh *yn ol*. Its etymology is not in dispute. It derives from the preposition *yn* ‘in’ plus a noun *ol* meaning ‘track(s), path, trail’, and is therefore itself an instance of grammaticalization. Together these form a complex preposition of a type that is widespread in Middle and Modern Welsh and in other Celtic languages. In fact, in a number of cases such complex prepositions have completely ousted earlier simple

\(^{14}\) Celtic languages have nonfinite verbal forms, traditionally referred to as verbnouns, which fulfil a number of infinitive-like and gerund-like functions in other languages. Welsh verbnouns are typically either identical to the verbal stem of inflected forms (as is the case with *nôl* or related to it by the addition of a lexically idiosyncratic suffix (as in *rhed-* ‘run’ > vn. *rhedeg* or *clyw-* ‘hear’ > vn. *clywed*). Citation forms of verbs throughout are verbnoun forms.
prepositions in concrete uses, for instance, Modern Welsh *o flaen* ‘in front of’ for earlier *rhad*, and Modern Welsh *yn ystod* ‘during, in the course of’ for earlier *er*. The noun *ol* itself is attested in Middle Welsh, as in (19), and survives into present-day Welsh, usually with the slightly more abstract meaning ‘trace’, often in the plural form *olion* ‘traces, remains’.

(19) Ac *ol* y march a welei.
    and tracks the horse PRT saw.IMPF.3S
    ‘And he saw the horse’s tracks.’ (P 11.9)

This lexical use of *ol* is relatively infrequent in Middle Welsh texts.\(^\text{15}\) The overwhelmingly most frequently attested context for *ol* is as part of complex prepositions, either in *yn ol* or *ar ol*.\(^\text{16}\) *Yn ol* is used in two major senses, first of all, a spatial meaning ‘behind, after’, usually directional, illustrated in (20); and, secondly, a temporal meaning ‘after’, illustrated in (21).

(20) Ac *yn ol* y baed y kerdassant…
    and after the boar PRT walk.PAST.3P
    ‘And they went after the boar…’ (PKM 55.20)

(21) A hi a glywei lef y corn, ac *yn ol* llef y corn
    and she PRT hear.IMPF.3S sound horn and after sound the horn
    llyma hyd blin yn mynet heibaw…
    there stag tired PROG go.VN past
    ‘And she heard the sound of a horn, and after the sound of the horn an exhausted stag went past…’ (PKM 84.14)

2.3.1.1 The grammaticalization path FOOTPRINT > BEHIND

These meanings fit in neatly with a hypothesized historical development fully consistent with the existing results of research on grammaticalization. The spatial meaning arose from grammaticalization of the phrase [yn ol] + [noun phrase], literally ‘in the track(s) of’, where [ol + noun phrase] once formed a larger possessive noun phrase. Grammaticalization of spatial prepositions from nouns is well attested. For instance, Heine & Kuteva (2002: 141) cite FOOTPRINT > BEHIND as a grammaticalization path, attested, for instance, in Zande, where the preposition *fuoi* ‘after’ derives from the noun *fuoi* ‘footprints, trace’:

\(^{15}\) Comments on Middle Welsh are based on an exhaustive search for (*yn / ar*) *ol* in the Middle Welsh texts, *Llyfr Blegywryd* (*L*), *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi* (*PKM*), *Peredur* (*P*), and *Ystoryaeu Seint Greal* (*YSG*).

\(^{16}\) *Ar ol* occurs once in *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi* (*PKM* 33.26), with the meaning ‘(spatial) after’. It is more frequent in later Middle Welsh texts, for instance *Ystoryaeu Seint Greal*, where it is also found in a temporal use, and has ultimately come to replace *yn ol* as the primary preposition for both spatial and temporal ‘after’. Since it is not central to the development of the verb *nôl*, further discussion of it will be omitted.
A number of syntactic and semantic facts show that grammaticalization of *yn ol* as a preposition was already complete in Middle Welsh. The object of *yn ol* is no longer restricted to noun phrases that denote entities that can plausibly have (foot)prints or tracks. For instance, in (23), weapons can hardly leave tracks, so the function of *yn ol* must be prepositional.

(23) Ac ar hynny, *yn ol* yr arueu *yd* aeth hi.  
And on this after the weapons went she  
‘And at this, she went after the weapons.’ (PKM 82.22)

There are also cases where, although still spatial and directional, a meaning such as ‘on someone’s trail’ or ‘along someone’s track’ is barely appropriate. In these cases, a generalization of meaning, such as that generally observed in the semantic bleaching often associated with grammaticalization, is apparent (cf. PKM 12.2, 33.14). Both types of evidence suggest that a form of semantic bleaching, specifically a widening of the semantic contexts where the use of the item is appropriate, had already taken place. A further generalization of meaning is noticeable in cases where *yn ol* is used in expressions that mean ‘seek, look for, demand, go after’, where the idea of motion is either only vaguely present, as in (24a), or where it is subordinate to the sense of ‘searching for’, as in (24b).

(24) a. Mi a baraf iawn * y ti * yn gyntaf, ac *yn ol*  
I cause.1S compensation for you PRD first, and after  
uy iawn * y bydaf * inheu.  
my compensation PRD be.FUT.1S I-too  
‘I shall get compensation for you first, and [then] I will be after compensation for myself.’ (PKM 74.16)

b. Ac ar hynny nachaf varchwcy yn *dyuot*, ac *amouyn a*  
and on this lo knight PROG come.VN and ask.VN with  
Pheredur a welsee * y kyfryw varchawc * yd oed ef  
Peredur Q see.PLUPERF.3S the such knight REL was he  
yn y ol. after.3SM  
‘And thereupon a knight arrived, and asked Peredur whether he had seen a knight like the one he was after / he was following.’ (P 28.24)

Note also, that syntactically no verb of motion is present in either of the examples in (24). The example in (24b) might even be considered, in and of itself, as an instance of a degrammaticalization path BEHIND > FOLLOW (cf. Heine & Kuteva’s grammaticalization path FOLLOW > BEHIND). For these reasons, it seems safe to
conclude that the grammaticalization of *yn ol* from prepositional phrase to preposition had been completed by the time of these texts.

### 2.3.1.2 The grammaticalization path BEHIND (SPATIAL) > AFTER

*Yn ol* in Middle Welsh is also used in a temporal meaning ‘after (in time)’. This meaning is secondary. This can be inferred (weakly) from general facts about grammaticalization, namely the fact that, cross-linguistically, temporal meanings typically derive historically from spatial meanings, and, specifically, BEHIND (SPATIAL) > AFTER is a recognized grammaticalization path (Heine & Kuteva 2002: 52). Synchronically in Middle Welsh, evidence for the grammaticalization (although of course not its directionality) comes from cases that are ambiguous between a spatial and temporal meaning, and which therefore instantiate the sort of context in which this scenario for grammaticalization could have arisen:

(25) a. Ac rac diruwr wres y kyrchwys y bleit a ’e
    and for great heat PRT charge.PAST.3S the wall with 3SM
    yscwyd a ’y tharaw gantaw allan, ac yn y ol ynteu y
    shoulder and 3SF hit.VN by.3SM out and after/behind him his
    wrfic.
    ‘And because of the great heat, he charged the wall with his shoulder and hit
    it out, and after / behind him his wife [went] too.’ (PKM 36.21)

        b. …a ’r baed yn kyrchu yr gaer yn uuan, a ’r
   and the boar PROG head.for to the fortress PRD swift and the
   cwn yn y ol.
   dogs after/behind him
   ‘…and the boar was heading for the fortress swiftly, with the dogs after it / behind it.’ (PKM 55.23)

### 2.3.1.3 The path AFTER > ACCORDING TO

The two uses discussed so far account for the majority of cases of *yn ol* in Middle Welsh texts, but some other uses are worth noting. One is its use after nouns and verbs of emotion to encode the cause or source of the emotion, for instance, *hiraeth yn ol* ‘longing for, after’ (*P* 40.18), or *galar yn ol* ‘mourning for, after’ (*PKM* 26.24). This use is again consistent with the view that *yn ol* undergoes grammaticalization, since the acquisition of more abstract grammatical prepositional uses in fact represents a further stage of the process.

For the future development of the preposition, one particular sense for *yn ol*, namely ‘according to’, is of great importance, even though it is rare, albeit attested, in Middle Welsh. *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru* (the University of Wales dictionary, R. J. Thomas 1950–2002) cites the following example from a medieval law text as the

---

track’. Secondly, in addition to grammaticalization of semantics, grammaticalization of syntax, in the form of a category change from preposition to verb, would be necessary. The first condition may well not be met in this instance. The second condition is clearly not met with the meaning of ‘follow’, but it is hard to see why degrammaticalization of BEHIND > FOLLOW should be excluded in principle.
earliest example (the discussion concerns whether an unborn child should be treated as male or female for the purposes of calculating blood-money):

\[\text{(26)}\] E keureyth a deweyt bot en yaunhaf barnu
the law PRT say.PRES.3S be.VN PRD more.correct judge.VN
en ol e peth pennaf, a bot galanas gur arnu
according to the thing main and be.VN blood.money man on.3SM
a henne ene uedydhyer.
and that until baptize.PRES.SUBJ.IMPERS
‘The law says that it is more correct to judge according to the more important thing, and that it [the unborn child] has the blood-money value of a man until it is baptized.’ (LII 65.9–11)

It is natural to suppose that this meaning arises out of the temporal meaning of \(\text{yn ol}\), from contexts where to do something later than someone else is to do something in the same way, following their pattern. The example in (27) illustrates the sort of context that is envisaged.

\[\text{(27)}\] A gwedy hynny Lawnslot a dyngawd a Gwalchmai
and after that Lawnslot PRT swear.PAST.3S and Gwalchmai
a Pheredur a Bwrt a Lionel a chwbyl o’r milwyr
and Peredur and Bwrt and Lionel and all of the warriors
ereill pob un yn ol y gilyd.
other every one after each other
‘And after that, Lawnslot swore an oath, and Gwalchmai and Peredur and Bwrt and Lionel and all the other warriors, each one after the others / each one in the same way as the others.’ (YSG 451)

Again, this is paralleled in other languages, for instance German \(\text{nach} \) ‘after’ > ‘according to’, although present-day Welsh has perhaps gone further than most in abandoning the spatial and temporal meanings of Middle Welsh \(\text{yn ol}\) entirely, in favour of the meaning ‘according to’, which in present-day Welsh is the only usual meaning of \(\text{yn ôl}\). \(\text{Yn ôl}\) has become obsolete as a preposition meaning ‘after’, although the spatial meaning survives in some related adverbial uses, in particular, the adverb \(\text{yn ôl} \) ‘behind’ in contexts such as ‘to leave something behind’.\[18\]

2.3.2 Early Modern Welsh \(nôl\) as degrammaticalization
So far, the story of \(\text{yn ol}\) has been one of successive processes of grammaticalization. It seems clear that by late Middle Welsh, \(\text{yn ol}\) was fully grammaticalized as a spatial and temporal preposition, having moved away from its origins as a prepositional phrase, and, alongside these meanings, had even acquired the meaning ‘according to’, the ultimate end of its grammaticalization path. It is therefore perhaps surprising that,

\[18\] The main preposition for ‘(temporal) after’ and ‘(spatial) behind, after’ is \(\text{ar ôl}\) in Modern Welsh, a form that first appears (with both senses) in the fourteenth-century text \(\text{Ystorya Bown de Hamtwn}\) (R. J. Thomas 1959–2002: 2640). It is also well attested in the late-fourteenth-century \(\text{Ystoryaeu Seint Greal}\). This is of course also a grammaticalization from \(\text{ol} \) ‘track, trail’.
precisely at this point in its development, it should have begun to develop a highly lexical use, which led eventually to the emergence of a new verb, (nonfinite) verb noun nôl ‘fetch’. This verb is found in a number of northern Welsh dialects today, alongside variants dôl (Bangor, Fynes-Clinton 1913: 397) and (h)ôl (southern). For some speakers, it has a full regular inflectional paradigm, for instance, with first person singular future nola ‘I will fetch’ or third person singular past nolodd ‘he, she fetched’.

The University of Wales dictionary cites the following example as a case of the type of sentence from which this may have arisen (R. J. Thomas 1950–2002: 2595):

(28) Yna yd aeth y gweisson yn ol y varch a e arueu then PRT went the lads after his horse and his weapons for Arthur.

‘Then the lads went after his horse and his weapons for Arthur. / Then the lads went to fetch his horse and his weapons for Arthur.’ (P 41.19)

There are in fact plenty of similar examples in Middle Welsh. Further cases are given in (29).

(29) a. Dos yn ol y marchawc a aeth odyma y’r weirglawd…
   go.IMPER after the knight REL went.3S from-here to.the meadow ‘Go after the knight who went away from here to the meadow…’ (P 13.26)
   b. drwc y medreist am dyn fôl a yrreist yn [ol] y bad PRTbe-able.PAST.2S for man fool REL send.PAST.2S after the knight ‘you treated badly the fool that you sent after the knight’ (P 14.27)
   c. “Ie, Arglwyd,” heb wy, “anuon etwa genhadeu yn y ol.”
   yes lord said they send.IMPER again messengers after.him ‘Yes, Lord,” they said, “send more messengers after him.” (PKM 33.14)
   d. “Kyuodwch … ac ewch yn y ol,” heb ef…
   get-up.IMPER.2P and go.IMPER.2P after-him said he ‘Get up … and go after him,” he said…’ (PKM 33.16)

Cases such as these seem entirely plausible as the input construction that led to the emergence of a new verb. Speakers and learners encountering data such as (28) are faced with an ambiguity: is yn ol a preposition ‘after’ or a sequence of the (pre-existing) purpose marker y ‘to’ plus an unknown nonfinite verb ‘fetch’? Such ambiguity sets the scene for the structural reanalysis in (30).

---

19 It is possible that speakers considered the possibility that this involved a verb with the meaning ‘fetch’ because of contact with English, which lexicalizes the concept ‘go and bring back’ as fetch. Previously, Welsh had expressed this with the verb dwyn ‘bear, carry, take’, which had a wider range of meanings, and did not necessarily imply going somewhere in order to get something. The change could therefore be characterized as contact-induced degrammaticalization (cf. on contact-induced grammaticalization, Heine & Kuteva 2003). However, this is clearly not the only factor. It is also worth noting that the verb dwyn had moved out of the relevant field in some
If this is indeed the source, then some of the properties of the process are surprising. The change from ‘go after’ to ‘go and fetch’ seems to involve pragmatic inferencing in the same way as standard examples of grammaticalization. If someone goes after something, then, on the assumption that the speaker is making a relevant contribution, it is quite likely that the purpose of going after something is to bring it back, in which case ‘go after’ may imply ‘go and fetch’. This is illustrated with English after in (31). In (31a), there is no implicature; whereas, in (31b), it is implied that I will bring bread back if at all possible. In English, this implicature is not yet conventionalized with after, and pragmatic inferencing has never led to degrammaticalization.

(31) a. I went after him (to find out where he was going).
   b. I went after some bread because we ran out.

This seems to be the same stage as Middle Welsh has reached in (29). In (29a) and (29b), it is clear from context that Peredur (the addressee in (29a), and the ‘foolish man’ in (29b)) is not supposed to return with the knight, but rather merely to find him and challenge him. In (29c) and (29d), the messengers are given the option of bringing back the Irish king, Matholwch (‘he’ in both sentences). However, in none of these examples does it seem to be the case that use of yn ol means that someone must attempt to bring something or someone back. In that sense, ‘fetching’ may be implied or inferred but is not (yet) part of the lexical meaning. The pragmatic inference has not yet been conventionalized and has not yet led to degrammaticalization.

This case clearly involves pragmatic inferencing. If so, it demonstrates that pragmatic inferencing is a bidirectional process, in the sense that it can lead from a more grammatical to a more lexical meaning despite the fact that standard examples of it (such as English going to) involve the reverse direction. This inevitably leads to the question of why pragmatic inferencing should lead from the grammatical to the lexical in the particular cases under consideration, that is, what makes them different from standard cases.

Degrammaticalization of nôl involves ‘split’, or ‘divergence’ in the sense of Hopper & Traugott (1993: 116–117), a phenomenon also typical of grammaticalization. The context of incipient degrammaticalization is only one of the environments in which yn ol may appear. In the other environments it survives with its existing meaning.

It is hard to be certain exactly when nôl had fully degrammaticalized, and thereby acquired the status of a full lexical verb. The first examples of the verb nôl cited varieties of spoken Welsh by the sixteenth century, having developed the dominant sense ‘steal, take without permission’.

20 An anonymous referee for Linguistics suggests an alternate bracketing for the input structure, namely [pp [p yn] [pp [p ol] y varch]]. Even this structure would be consistent with the essential point that the category status of yn ol is functional (P) in the input to reanalysis, but lexical (V) in the output.
in the University of Wales dictionary are from the sixteenth century (R. J. Thomas 1950–2002: 2595):

(32) a. Da i awen aeth Duw yw nol…
   good his muse go.PAST.3S God to+him fetch.VN…
   ‘His muse [being] good, God went to fetch him…’
  (Barddoniaeth Wiliam Llyn 120)

b. …anfon kenad I nol gwrailais a Orvc Uthrr.
   send.VN messenger to fetch.VN Gwrlais PRT did Uthr
   ‘…Uthr sent a messenger to fetch Gwrlais.’
  (Llanstephan 195, 153)

Some (for instance, (32b)), but by no means all, of the early ones could possibly be analyzed as instances of the preposition, although they are spelled in a way that implies the writers understood them to be distinct from the preposition. Examples with verbal inflection (for instance nolodd ‘fetched (third person singular past)’, and a new variant of the verbnoun, noli) are given for the seventeenth century, and these provide clear evidence that nol had developed into a verb by this time. This is illustrated in (33), with a second-person-plural imperative form, nolwch.

(33) Nolwch y Brenin i ’w examnio.
   fetch.2P.IMPER the King to 3SM examine.VN
   ‘Fetch the King to be cross-examined.’
   (RhC 860, late 17th century)

A parallel development occurred through reanalysis based on the form hól, which would appear in the first person singular, third person singular feminine, first person plural and the third person plural of the paradigm of the preposition yn ol (see the paradigm in Table 4). Plausible inputs to the reanalysis, with good contexts for pragmatic inferencing, can be found in Middle Welsh, such as (34), where ‘after me’ implies ‘to fetch me’.

(34) “Dywet,” heb y marchawc, “a weleisti neb o ’r tell.IMPER said the knight Q see.PAST.2s+you anyone from the llys yn dyuot y’m hol i?”
   court PROG come.VN after.me
   “‘Tell me,” said the knight, “have you seen anyone from the court coming after me?’”
   (P 14.7)

Unambiguously verbal uses of hól are found from around 1600, and are illustrated in (35). The earliest example in the University of Wales dictionary dates from a text composed in 1687.

---

21 The gap between reanalysis of nol as a verb and the appearance of inflected forms appears to be a real phenomenon, and not simply a gap in textual attestation. This is suggested by the fact that, for some speakers of modern Welsh, nól is a defective verb, still having only a verbnoun.

22 Sources for Table 4: 1s. P 14.7; 2s. PKM 19.7, 76.23; P 9.5; 3sm. PKM 1.17, 22.24, 26.24, 32.14, 32.16, 34.16, 35.21, 54.23, 82.16; 3sf. PKM 9.27, 12.2; 1p. PKM 69.14; 2p. PKM 69.21; 3p. PKM 28.18; P 47.9.
The geographical distribution of forms, nôl in northern dialects, hôl in southern dialects, may at first sight seem arbitrary, but a very satisfactory historical explanation for their distribution can in fact be arrived at, provided the reanalysis account of the historical development is accepted. The form nôl can be reached by reanalysis of yn ol in virtually any context. In particular a non-pronominal context is entirely adequate; compare example (28), which could give rise to the reanalysis yn ol y varch ‘after his horse’ > y nol y varch ‘to fetch his horse’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sing.</th>
<th>plur.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>y’m hol (i)</td>
<td>yn an ol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>y’th ol (di)</td>
<td>yn ych ol (chwi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>yn y ol (m.)</td>
<td>yn eu hol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yn y hol (f.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Paradigm of yn ol in Middle Welsh (minor spelling variation ignored).

With hôl, however, things are different. On the basis of the evidence in Table 4, it seems that hôl can arise only by reanalysis of the first person singular form of yn ol, namely y’m hol (i). All other forms either contain an /n/, and hence would give rise to nol; or else they lack the /h/, and therefore fail to account for the initial /h/ of hôl. This means that, at first sight, the frequency of the syntactic pattern that gave rise to nôl was far higher than the frequency of the syntactic pattern that gave rise to hôl.

In fact, the input pattern for hôl must have been quite rare, so rare that the reanalysis seems almost implausible. I suggest, therefore, that this reanalysis was unlikely to take place in the ‘classical’ Middle Welsh variety, but must have taken place in a variety with slightly different linguistic properties. Sixteenth-century southern Welsh is a variety that provides rather better conditions. First of all, the loss of the /n/ of yn ol, found in Middle Welsh before a first- or second-person preposed genitive pronoun (y’m hol ‘after me’, y’th ol ‘after you’), spread analogically at least to the first person plural. Thus, we find y’n herbyn ni ‘against us’ (GR 585) for earlier expected yn an herbyn ni (and therefore presumably also y’n hol ni for earlier yn an ol ‘behind us’, PKM 71.13–14). Secondly, loss of or uncertainty about the phoneme /h/, a characteristic of southern varieties of Welsh today, had probably already begun to be manifested in the south by this time.
3 EXPLANATIONS FOR DEGRAMMATICALIZATION

These three case studies document fairly clearly the existence of a type of syntactic degrammaticalization that has a good claim to being described as ‘grammaticalization in reverse’. Detailed examination of the evidence for them demonstrates the involvement of syntactic reanalysis, both as category reanalysis (pronoun > noun and preposition > verb) and structural reanalysis (in the case of nôl, [PP [p y noI] NP] > [IP y [VP [v nol] NP]]). Pragmatic inferencing is very clearly involved in the case of nôl (‘go after something’ implies ‘go and fetch something’). Metonymic developments are also evident in the case of eiddo (metonymic link from something ‘belonging to someone’ to being ‘property’), which could perhaps also be formulated in terms of pragmatic inferencing (‘X belongs to someone’ implies ‘X is property’). The semantic shift is more nebulous in the case of nešto, but may also be broadly characterized as metonymic.

The processes seem to be of the same type (reanalysis, pragmatic inferencing, lexical semantic change involving metonymy) as those encountered in grammaticalization, but with the outcome reversed. The conclusion then is that both reanalysis and pragmatic inferencing are bidirectional processes. This conclusion is not particularly controversial in the case of reanalysis, but is perhaps more surprising in the case of the semantic and pragmatic developments associated with grammaticalization, for instance, in the light of such statements as “Change by inference as well as by generalization appears to be unidirectional” (Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994: 13) (cf. also the discussion in Traugott & König 1991: 192–193).²³ Many linguists have considered grammaticalization to be built up out of a number of separate and conceptually independent processes (for instance, Fischer 2000: 149–153). If this view is taken, it is to be expected that each of the individual processes should have properties of its own. In fact, on such a view, unidirectionality might be expected to hold (or not hold) independently on each of a number of dimensions (Campbell 2001: 132–133). The conclusion that some of them are bidirectional leads inevitably to the conclusion that, under some circumstances, they may together build cases of grammaticalization that are counterdirectional.

The relationship between grammaticalization and degrammaticalization in this respect may be viewed as parallel to that between assimilation and dissimilation in sound change. While assimilation is regarded as the historical norm, no one denies the existence of dissimilation, which is generally regarded as being the result of language learners’ attempts to ‘discount’ or reverse processes of assimilation in their linguistic experience, a process which Ohala (1993: 249) describes as “‘correction’ erroneously implemented”.

3.1 Divergence and isolation

The similarities between grammaticalization and syntactic lexicalization do not stop here. Grammaticalization frequently leads to the split or divergence of a single item. As

²³ It is necessary to distinguish two ‘directions’ in pragmatic inferencing here: from concrete to abstract, and strengthening rather than weakening of inference. Clearly, the current example violates the former by creating a more concrete meaning from a less concrete one, but it does involve strengthening of inference.
it grammaticalizes in one context, it remains ungrammaticalized in another, and the two diverge, resulting in independent lexical items, and independent subsequent histories. This has happened, for instance, with English *one*, the weak form of which grammaticalized into the indefinite article *a(n)* in Old English (Hopper & Traugott 1993: 117). Once the two diverged, they were subject to radically different phonological developments.

Divergence is a feature of all the deggrammaticalizations discussed here. In each case, the ‘undeggrammaticalized’ variant survives. In the case of Bulgarian *nešto* and Welsh *eiddo*, it survives in more or less the same function and syntax as it had previously. In the case of Welsh *nôl*, divergence involves both items shifting, and, in fact, a striking aspect of the development is the large extent to which divergence had taken place prior to deggrammaticalization, and may therefore be viewed as a cause of deggrammaticalization. The deggrammaticalized verb *nôl* is attested in the seventeenth century, by which time the preposition *yn ôl* was already seriously restricted in use in its former core spatial and temporal meanings. This is clearer from Figure 1, which summarizes the functions of *yn ôl* / *nôl* over time.

![Figure 1. Summary of the development of *yn ôl* / *nôl*.](image)

This suggests a restriction on deggrammaticalization, along the lines of ‘In order to deggrammaticalize, a form must have become grammatically or semantically isolated’. By ‘semantically isolated’ is meant that the lexical semantics of the item in question no longer involves a regular relationship with other items containing the same morpheme(s). Consider how this applies to the case of Welsh *nôl*. At the relevant point in the history of Welsh, *yn ôl* had developed the primary meaning ‘according to’ via the
grammaticalization path AFTER (TEMPORAL) > ACCORDING TO. It had more or less abandoned its earlier temporal and spatial meanings ‘after’ and ‘behind’, except that these survived as relics in a few frequent (perhaps idiomatic) constructions, such as ‘go after’ and ‘leave behind’. The semantic relationship between yn ôl meaning ‘according to’ and the cases where it meant ‘(prepositional) (spatial) after’ or ‘(adverbial) behind’ was not regular – the relationship cannot be derived by synchronic pragmatic inference, since the intervening meaning ‘(temporal) after’ had been lost entirely. Learners must therefore have posited ‘according to’ as the meaning of yn ôl, but were then left with the task of working out the syntax and semantics of cases where yn ôl clearly does not mean ‘according to’. There is no synchronic link from these cases to another item, and therefore no limit on the range of hypotheses that a learner may entertain about the syntactic category and semantic value of the item in question. My claim is that this is a possible scenario for degrammaticalization.

Isolation is also evident in the case of eiddo and nešto, albeit not as a result of grammaticalization. Isolation here is grammatical: by grammatical isolation is meant that the item does not form part of a synchronic paradigm (broadly defined to include not only paradigms of case and person-number forms, but also other paradigmatically organized parts of the grammar, including, here, paradigmatic relations within pronominal systems). Nešto becomes isolated as the result of two other changes: its counterpart in the system of interrogative pronouns, Old Church Slavonic čĭto ‘what’, becomes obsolete and is replaced by the unrelated kakvo; and its case forms become obsolete as a result of the loss of morphological case in Bulgarian nouns. With eiddo, the situation is less clear, but other forms of the pronoun (such as eiddof ‘mine’ or eiddot ‘yours’) are considered literary in modern Welsh, and are not used in unscripted speech. Use of these pronouns may already have been restricted in the spoken language at the period when degrammaticalization was taking place. This would have left the third-person masculine singular form eiddo alone in the spoken language without a paradigm.

In some other cases of degrammaticalization (deflexion) it is noticeable that the degrammaticalized form has become isolated within the grammatical system as a result of other independent changes. With the English and Swedish possessives, it seems crucial that both languages in question were losing case marking on nouns during the period in which the genitive case ending degrammaticalized as a possessive clitic. The genitive ending could no longer be fitted into a productive grammatical system. The same applies to Irish -muid, which was the only person-number ending in an otherwise analytic paradigm at the point when it degrammaticalized into the pronoun muid(e) ‘we’ (Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994: 13–14; see also Newmeyer 2001: 208).

This leaves degrammaticalization closely related to exaptation, the reuse of marginal material (‘junk’) in a new grammatical context (Lass 1990). Traugott (2001: 12) has recently drawn attention to the special place that exaptation may have in degrammaticalization, noting that, in exaptation, “individual morphemes have become relatively unanalyzable, or have lost connectedness with other member of their class, and have opportunistically and idiosyncratically been reused”. This is effectively the same as the scenario that has been sketched for the cases of degrammaticalization discussed above. The differences are that exaptation standardly (but perhaps not

---

24 In spoken present-day Welsh, either a circumlocution using the verb piâu ‘belongs’ would be used, or else the pronominal un ‘one’ (e.g. f’un i ‘my one’ with fy ... i ‘my’).
necessarily) involves morphemes, not words, and that, in standard examples of exaptation, the function of the morpheme undergoing exaptation is said to have become completely obsolete before exaptation takes place. In the examples discussed here, the items had become isolated, having lost connectedness with other members of their class, but had not become meaningless. They were then reassigned to a different class (category). Whereas in standard cases of exaptation, the speakers are left with two options – either to create a new function for the ‘junk’ material, or else to do away with it entirely – the cases of degrammaticalization discussed here seem to allow another possibility, namely to allow the item in question to continue in its marginal function (cf. the retention of *yn ôl* as a historical relic in modern Welsh as an adverb meaning ‘(left) behind’). Traugott (2001: 13) further notes that “it is probable that some of the most important counterexamples [to unidirectionality of grammaticalization] will turn out to be instances of exaptation”. Given a somewhat modified definition of exaptation, the examples discussed here could be accommodated within it.

3.2 Morphological factors in degrammaticalization

Another factor which seems relevant in degrammaticalization, and which may represent a serious barrier to it, is the fact that the target categories for degrammaticalization are typically inflected. Target categories for degrammaticalization, nouns and verbs, typically inflect, whereas target categories for grammaticalization, such as complementizers, prepositions or grammatical markers, do not need to acquire

---

25 It is hard to see that this can really be the case, since it would imply that it is possible in language acquisition to learn the distribution of a morpheme that has no function (whether formal or semantic).

26 Heine (2003) makes a distinction between exaptation, where “grammatical forms which have lost most or all of their semantic content … are put to new uses as semantically distinctive grammatical forms”, and adaptation, where “old taxa are adapted to new taxonomic categories … in particular to adapt grammatical forms to new word classes or morphological paradigms”. Heine calls adaptation a process, and, if it is a process, it is presumably identical to what has been called category reanalysis in this paper. Exaptation is related, in that it is category reanalysis (primarily of morphological categories), where the input form has already become obsolete as a member of its original category. I agree with Heine that category reanalysis (adaptation) does not exhibit any exceptionless directionality, although category reanalyses do tend towards moving in the direction of more grammatical. I also agree that category reanalysis is one of the components of grammaticalization. However, it should be clear from details of the exposition in this paper that his assertion that category reanalysis / adaptation and exaptation are so different from grammaticalization that counterdirectional instances of them do not amount to counterexamples to unidirectionality is not justified.

27 Kiparsky (2004) suggests that “apparent exceptions [to the unidirectionality of grammaticalization] are really instances of analogical change”. This seems to work better for the cases of deflexion that he discusses than for the cases of syntactic lexicalization discussed here. In particular, it is hard to see the reassignment of *yn ôl* to the category of verb as being analogical, unless the definition of analogy is defined so broadly as to be effectively meaningless.
inflection as they grammaticalize. For degrammaticalization to succeed, a grammatical item must be of a phonological form that could plausibly also be an inflected form of some lexical item. That is, for a grammatical item to be reanalyzed as a verb, it must look as though it has some appropriate form of person, number and tense marking. Similarly, for it to degrammaticalize as a noun, it must look as though it has some appropriate form of case and number marking. This situation must arise by chance, but in a highly inflected language this is unlikely. From the start, then, degrammaticalization will be restricted to occurring in relatively isolating languages, or, at least, subsystems of particular languages that are in the process of becoming more isolating.

This is really a subcase of the generalization that the potential for structural ambiguity (the availability of two plausible competing analyses for speakers) is central to reanalysis (Timberlake 1977), and is perhaps a necessary condition for it. If the existing grammar of the language makes available two possible morphological analyses for the item in question, the possibility of reanalysis can be entertained. If the inflectional system is such that no plausible analysis of the item as a member of a lexical category is available, then reanalysis is excluded.

Again, chance factors in the three case studies examined here happen to provide the right conditions. In the cases of Welsh nôl, the crucial morphological factor is the fact that, although most Welsh nonfinite verbs (verbnouns) are formed from a verbal stem plus a suffix, a number of very common ones have a zero ending. Examples include agor ‘open’, ateb ‘answer’, cau ‘close’, dal ‘catch, hold’ and deall ‘understand’. Nôl is therefore a perfectly plausible form for a verbnoun. Similar factors apply in the case of Bulgarian неšto, which just happens to be a morphologically plausible form for a nominative singular neuter noun (with ending –o). In the case of eiddo, the fact that it was a highly plausible form for a masculine third-person-singular form of an inflected preposition (despite unambiguous syntactic and semantic evidence that it was not a preposition) seems to have played an important role in its early development. Later, it was important that Welsh places no restrictions on the form of nouns, and that nouns in the language inflect only for number (not case). Furthermore, a noun meaning ‘property’ could be assumed to be a mass noun with no plural, hence even the negative evidence (the absence of an attested plural form) could play no role.

Finally, it is worth pointing out that, if it is assumed that morphosyntactic change can occur during the discontinuity of language transmission between generations, it is hard to see how such counterdirectional category reassignment could be excluded from a theory of language change. Given that children acquiring their language have no direct access to the grammar(s) that form the basis of the adult language that they hear around them (Andersen 1973, Janda 2001), they must build hypotheses about the category membership of each item in their language. As Janda (2001: 267) points out, they “cannot know … if the global status that earlier speakers … assigned to a particular linguistic element … was lexical or grammatical”. This means that category reanalysis from grammatical to lexical should in principle be possible during the discontinuity of transmission between generations.

4 CONCLUSION

This paper has focused on three case studies of degrammaticalization that involve upgrading of a grammatical item to a fully lexical category. Despite first appearances, these cases turn out to have little in common with standard examples of lexicalization of
grammatical items, such as *to down (a beer)*. Rather, they involve processes of syntactic reanalysis, and in some cases also pragmatic inferencing. The continuity of development from the grammatical item to its degrammaticalized lexical form is striking. The similarity of the processes involved to those found in grammaticalization justifies the claim that these cases really are instances of ‘grammaticalization in reverse’, and therefore represent the syntactic counterpart of deflexion, which often involves upgrading from affix to clitic or phonological word via morphological reanalysis.

The existence of these examples leads inevitably to the question as to why degrammaticalization of this type should be rare. These three examples suggest two conditions that may severely limit the possibilities for this type of degrammaticalization:

(i) the potential source of degrammaticalization must have become grammatically or semantically isolated;
(ii) the potential source of degrammaticalization must (by chance) be morphophonologically acceptable (ambiguous) as some potential form of a lexical category.

Further instances of this type of degrammaticalization need to be examined in order to establish the extent to which these conditions apply more generally.
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