Grammaticalization and Diachronic Structural Pattern

Concepción Company Company
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
concepcion.company@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6351-715X

Abstract

The paper posits the hypothesis that if a form or construction entering a process of grammaticalization has a diachronic structural pattern, the grammaticalization may become entrenched and strengthened; it can recategorize and move easily into other grammatical areas, can make more complex diachronic paths, and will progress better than a change without a pattern. The paper poses two types of structural pattern: an intraparadigmatic one and an interparadigmatic one. The empirical evidence is the grammaticalization of the predication *dice que* into the evidential discourse marker *dizque* and later into the adjective *dizque*. The paper examines two patterns supporting this grammaticalization: first, the various grammaticalizations undergone by the verb *decir* into different discourse particles, an intraparadigmatic pattern, and second, three predications that undergone the same diachronic path: *que es que > quesque*; *puede que > pueque*; *vaya > ¡vaya!*, an interparadigmatic pattern.

Keywords: discourse marker; evidentiality; grammaticalization; historical syntax; structural pattern

Resum. *Gramaticalització i pauta estructural diacrònica*

L'estudi planteja la hipòtesi que, si una forma o construcció que entra en un procés de gramaticalització té una pauta estructural diacrònica, la gramaticalització es pot consolidar i enfortir, es pot recategoritzar i desplaçar fàcilment cap a altres àrees gramaticals, pot fer recorreguts diacrònics més complexos i progressarà millor que un canvi sense pauta. L'article planteja dos tipus de pauta estructural: un d'intraparadigmàtic i un altre d'interparadigmàtic. L'evidència empírica que s'hi aporta és el cas de la gramaticalització de la predicació *dice que* al marcador discursiu evidencial *dizque* i més tard a l'adjectiu *dizque*. L'estudi examina dos pautes que donen suport a aquesta gramaticalització: en primer lloc, les diverses gramaticalitzacions sofertes pel verb *decir* en diferents partícules discursives (pauta intraparadigmàtica) i, en segon lloc, tres predicats que van seguir la mateixa trajectòria diacrònica: *que es que > quesque*; *puede que > pueque*; *vaya > ¡vaya!* (pauta interparadigmàtica).

Paraules clau: marcador discursiu; evidencialitat; gramaticalització; sintaxi històrica; pauta estructural

Table of Contents

1. Introduction. Theoretical advances and some gaps

The numerous works on the framework or theoretical model known as *grammaticalization* that have appeared in the last thirty years have greatly enriched our descriptive and theoretical knowledge of what a language is and how it operates in its daily functioning, what a grammar is, how the mechanisms of change operate, both synchronically and diachronically, and how the interaction of language levels takes place in the dynamics of language change. In short, research on grammaticalization has produced a spectacular advance on language facts in general and on the mechanisms of grammatical change in particular. The three-decade time span that I establish here, symbolically and arbitrarily, is due to the fact that, in 1991, were published two works that, in my opinion, were seminal in deepening theoretical reflection on how languages change and in establishing the principles and parameters of change. One of them was *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual framework*, by Heine, Claudi & Hünnemeyer; the other was *Approaches to grammaticalization*, a set of articles collected in two volumes edited by Traugott & Heine. There were undoubtedly works that had already addressed these dynamics in a general way, such as Meillet's (1912: 131), which is widely cited for being the first to use the term *grammaticalization,* understood as the "attribution du caractère grammatical à un mot jadis autonome", or Givón's (1971), with the famous aphorism "today's morphology is yesterday's syntax", to cite just a couple of texts. And, with no doubt, grammaticalization, understood either as a theoretical framework or as a theoretical model, continues to motivate a great deal of research.

   The aforementioned enrichment has led to an almost practical parallelism between grammaticalization and historical grammar today, although the latter still incorporates philological and ecdotic aspects not usually present in the former. Research on grammaticalization has, in turn, been nourished by many disciplines that have provided it with new data and new theoretical reflections, among others, typology in the first place, sociolinguistics, corpus linguistics, cognitive linguistics, general linguistics, text linguistics and language acquisition, to mention those which, from my perspective, are better aligned with grammaticalization. However, there remain some gaps, as it is logical in any field of research, one of them is the subject of this paper: the relationship between grammaticalization and diachronic structural pattern.

   I will first focus on the advances that I consider fundamental, in order to establish some theoretical coordinates as a starting point for a better understanding of the

hypothesis and analysis that I will develop. The work on grammaticalization has made evident 20 facts, at least, which seem to me to be central to current diachronic research. This presentation is far from being a state of the art on grammaticalization, which would be unwieldy; it is only my perspective on how developments in grammaticalization have nuanced and enriched our understanding of the facts of language and, moreover, of the dynamics of change. Such aspects, which are taken for granted today, were far from being so in the structuralist paradigms of a few decades ago. I will refer, in particular, to facts of syntax, because syntax is what this paper is about. They are the following:

1. The natural state of language functioning is variation; in other words, variation is inherent in linguistic manifestation, whatever the number of speakers a language has and whatever its geographical spread. Variation consists in the possibility of choosing one grammatical strategy over another; therein lies the very essence of synchronic linguistic operation, which may or may not crystallize in historical diachronic change. There is no historical change without prior synchronic variation. In this freedom of choice also lies the creativity of syntax. There is no such thing as a uniform system or a stable synchrony, even if uniformity and stability remain a necessity of analysis and an ideal of research.

2. The evolution of a language is the sum of continuity + discontinuity since linguistic change is both preservation of structure and its alteration. Both, in never balanced interdependence, are inherent to the functioning of any language. The essence of language is a constant imperceptible transformation. Continuity over the centuries is undoubtedly the most striking fact of the syntactic-semantic evolution of language. Continuity is, moreover, theoretically and epistemologically necessary for discontinuity or change to occur.

3. A syntactic change is a small documentable or observable discontinuity in the larger continuity that is the evolution of a language. The fact that a change is a small discontinuity ensures that the change never affects the system as a whole, so that the preservation of communication is always assured. Overlaps, blurred categorical boundaries, indecisions in analysis and ambiguous contexts are a consequence of the dialectic between continuity and discontinuity. Another consequence of the persistent continuity is that syntactic change is cumulative, in the sense that innovative forms and meanings often coexist for centuries alongside conservative or original etymological forms and meanings. Diachrony usually leaves traces in synchrony in the form of residues and/or irregularities.

4. The consequence of preservation or persistent continuity is that the linguistic forms that constitute the source of the change are pre-existing and, therefore, in syntactic change there is never *ex novo* creation, but rather it basically consists of recreating or stirring up the previous lexical and/or grammatical matter, that is to say, there is no absolute syntactic creation, neither in the sentential or core syntax nor in the extrasentential or peripheral syntax.

5. Linguistic change, both synchronic and diachronic, is a creative event that achieves communicative success, most often beginning as an imperceptible

micro-break, or a minimal functional shift, in contexts and distributions that are conducive to such a break or shift. This creativity involves metaphoric and metonymic processes, many of which thrive on inferences drawn from the context, linguistic or extralinguistic, so that the listener associates explicit elements of that context with implicit meanings of the form or construction undergoing change. Most likely a large part of syntactic change is metonymically based, given the context dependence it requires.

6. One of the symptoms that a grammatical change is in progress is the speaker's awareness of a particular linguistic structure. Synchronically, a change is observed to be in progress when the speaker either asks *how do you say it*?, or alternates between two forms or constructions, or corrects either himself or his interlocutor. Thus, one can ask *¿cómo se dice: vamos a ponerle salsa* o *vamos a ponerle su salsa?* 'how do you say: we are going to add sauce on it or we are going to add its sauce on it'?, and this question is a symptom of a potential area of change in the language, but one never asks *¿cómo se dice: mesa o…?* 'how do you say: *table* or…?', which is a sign that this form has remained stable over more than two millennia. In diachronic perspective, it is much more difficult to apprehend changes in progress, since there are, obviously, no living speakers to ask. In these cases, as it is well- known, the most viable way is to compare different manuscripts or printings of the same text, if there are several testimonies; if we find variants for the same form or construction in this comparison, this means that the different amanuenses or scribes were aware of the form they were copying or listening to and that they therefore corrected by introducing a variant of the form in question, that is, they expressed the same semantic referential field with different forms, and this should be interpreted as an area of change in progress in the system.

7. Language functions in a dialectic, never balanced, between freedom-creativity, on the one hand, and secularly repeated routines with a high degree of fixity, which follow structural and lexical patterns, on the other. The sum of freedom and routinization is present in every speech act. The freedom-routine duality moves on a continuum of productivity-transparency vs. opacity-idiomaticity in which the first pair corresponds to the pole of freedom and the second to the pole of routine. Freedom-creativity is anchored, in turn, in the fact that the speaker may choose lexical items, may give them compositionality, may choose certain orders and achieve different informative results, may substitute synonyms for the chosen items and can paraphrase the resulting utterance. Discourse is, as is well known, the level of language with the greatest freedom-creativity of choice, followed by syntax, whose freedom, although very high, requires following rules of syntagmatic combinatorics.

8. The interaction and reciprocal conditioning between form and meaning is usual and expected in all linguistic functioning. Such an interaction is nowadays preferred to be called interface. In the process of grammar creation, a cohesive dynamic is established between formal conditioning and semantic-pragmatic motivations, which are complementary and of equal importance. There is no syntactic change without semantic-pragmatic change of some kind, and seman-

tic change usually entails syntactic change because it affects changes in the distribution, function and/or selection of forms.

9. Syntactic analysis requires incorporating an enriched semantics which covers not only lexical or conceptual meaning but also procedural or evaluative meaning, and incorporating pragmatics, which includes the speaker's intentions and his or her cultural knowledge as motivating axes of the syntagmatic organization of information. Semantics and pragmatics are therefore basic levels of language for understanding syntactic coding. Ultimately, syntax can be defined, as cognitive grammar does, as the symbolization of semantic-pragmatic contents.

10. A usual dynamics of syntactic change is categorial transposition, i.e. reanalysis, either through the reattachment of one form to another categorial zone within the core grammar, or through a constant moving in and out of the core grammar into the discourse grammar, also called periphery and thetical grammar, and, less frequently, from the discourse grammar into the core grammar. The creation of discourse cohesion, a moving towards the periphery, is an essential aspect of diachronic dynamics. Closely related to these dynamics is that processes of (inter)subjectivization – modality in the sense of traditional grammar – are a basic, essential mechanism of discourse cohesion building, and, in general, of grammar creation, since there are practically no objective utterances that do not involve, to some extent, the perspective and point of view of the speaker. In general, strongly subjective utterances entail syntactic impoverishment and even cancellation of the normal syntactic distribution of the form in question, because the speaker is not interested in describing the event in its nuances but in codifying his or her evaluation of the event, so that the speaker dispenses with the normal syntax of the form undergoing change.

11. The basic etymological meaning of a form or construction – also called *general meaning and schematic meaning* – is fundamental to understand how a grammatical change is generated. Forms maintain their basic, general, abstract meaning for centuries, which often coincides with features of the etymological meaning. This constant abstract meaning ensures that new extensions and distributions are not random or erratic, and that change follows regular and specific dynamics, consisting of a progression from contexts and distributions more akin to the etymological meaning to contexts and distributions less akin to it.

12. Linguistic forms do not change in isolation, but wrapped up in constructions, contexts and specific distributions, and even wrapped up in the textual genre and discursive tradition in which the innovation appears, to the point that it can be postulated that the unit of change is the distribution and the context, and that the textual genre and the discursive tradition operate as a macro-locus that favours the advance of certain changes. Not all changes are sensitive to textual genre conditioning.

13. Language has a cognitive basis and is a symbolic filter and reflection of a community's culture and world perception, a reflection always mediated by arbitrariness and conventionalization, so that different emphases, or outlines, lead to different grammars.

14. Multifunctionality – which is mainly covered by polysemy, although it is not theoretically equivalent – is inherent to the linguistic sign. It is, to a large extent, a consequence of syntactic-semantic change. In general, it is a polysemy of contexts and distributions, understood as an extension to new and more contexts, and not a polysemy of the linguistic sign itself.

15. Loss in syntactic change is rare or infrequent, because there is almost always a reuse or refunctionalization of forms or constructions. Moreover, syntax is always paraphrasable – unlike phonology or inflectional morphology –, and so it is often not possible to know whether a paraphrase is replacing a syntactic loss or is simply another syntactic possibility to express a referent or an event.

16. The relative frequency of use of a given form in different contexts, or of one form vs. another in similar contexts, is often the only indicator that syntactic change is taking place and that new grammatical routines are being generated to encode a grammatical area. Frequency is, in short, a symptom of how grammar changes or does not change.

17. There is a close relationship between syntactic change and the structure of the language lexicon, or, in other words, between the diachrony of a language and the structure of the dictionary, since numerous syntactic changes produce lexicalization, understood as invariable forms, collocations and fixed sequences, which must be incorporated into the dictionary. Lexicalization implies the enlargement of dictionaries.

18. Syntactic change is usually gradual and very slow. Gradualness and slowness mean that there are intermediate phases between two given stages or periods with minimal differences between them, it means that syntactic change is essentially internally motivated, and it means that conservative and innovative constructions coexist for centuries, a coexistence labelled as *accumulation*, as I have already said. Gradualness and slowness ensure that communication is preserved. Syntactic change often passes through contextual phases which are not necessarily linear: etymological context > bridging, ambiguous or critical context > context of change > context of generalization of the innovative form or construction. However, there are changes which are abrupt in character, either because they are not in themselves gradual or because there is not enough documentation to support the existence of intermediate phases. The possible abruptness of a change is directly related to two theoretical facts: how the essential preservation of structure to which I have referred to is understood and how communication between individuals is ensured.

19. External history may have a significant impact on the diachrony of grammar, in the sense that there are periods of diachronic inflection, and this inflection is often explained by a combination of internal history and large doses of external history. That is to say, the ultimate explanation for quite a few syntactic changes lies in the external history of the language.

20. Research in typology, or cross-linguistic variation, has been fundamental to a better understanding of the dynamics of language change, because it allows us to assess which changes are possible and expected in languages, in the form of universal paths of change, which are usual, which are specific to a language

family, and which are hyper-specific to a given language. In other words, typology sets limits to what is possible change, and reports common and "rare" facts in the diachrony of languages.

Notwithstanding this rich theoretical panorama, there are gaps or pending research on grammaticalization and, in general, on syntactic-semantic change, which is logical in the work of any discipline. Some gaps are aspects that have not yet been studied or have been little explored; others are polemical aspects that require revisiting the problem. Among the former, there are three that emerge: *a*) the relationship between contact and grammaticalization; *b*) the diachronic dynamics, similar or different, of lexical words and grammatical words; *c*) the relationship between grammaticalization and diachronic structural pattern. Among the latter, two aspects emerge which remain controversial: *d*) the relationship between grammaticalization and lexicalization, and *e*) the role of analogy in grammaticalization.

a) The first gap in analysis is the relationship between contact and grammaticalization, which requires starting by rethinking the classic problem of whether genuine borrowings in syntax really exist, and, if the answer is yes, following with a reflection on whether and to what extent the dynamics of grammaticalization by contact are similar to vernacular grammaticalizations. The link between contact and grammaticalization is already mentioned in the recent handbook *Grammaticalization*, by Narrog & Heine (2021: ch. 7), although it is taken for granted. The central question of whether it is a grammatical innovation or whether contact activates a possible latent syntactic pattern, as Gómez Seibane (2018) rightly proposes for a discursive expression of Spanish, is not raised. Undoubtedly, borrowings and calques are an important source of grammatical innovation, but syntax, as is well known, is a level of language that is rather reluctant to borrowings and, therefore, more research is needed.

b) The second gap is the similarities and differences in the dynamics and progress of a grammaticalization depending on whether lexical words or grammatical words are involved. There has been little research on this point. It should be noted that several new labels and nuances for the concept and term grammaticalization – secondary grammaticalization, refunctionalization, capitalization, etc. – have emerged when analysing syntactic-semantic changes of grammatical words, since being themselves grammatical, they cannot become more grammatical, thus escaping the traditional and original definition of grammaticalization.[1]

c) The third gap is the relationship between grammaticalization and the existence of a diachronic structural pattern in the area of grammar being analyzed. It is conceivable that the presence of a strong structural pattern in the form of simi-

---

1. An extensive theoretical discussion of what type or subtype of grammaticalization some grammatical prepositions in Spanish undergo appears in Company (2019), but the problem remains an open one for further research.

lar changes in the relevant domain may operate as an incentive to entrench or strengthen a grammaticalization, so that the form or construction in question can easily move to other grammatical areas, even to areas "not envisaged" by this theoretical model. One might think that a grammaticalization does not start if there is no pattern or model to support it, but this aspect has not been investigated either. This paper is about grammaticalization and diachronic structural pattern, as I have already pointed out.

d) The first controversial aspect, as I anticipated, is the relationship between lexicalization and grammaticalization. It is unresolved and even increasingly polysemic not only the term lexicalization but also the relationship of lexicalization to grammaticalization, as may be seen in the very different theoretical positions and definitions found in the specialized literature over almost forty years (Talmy 1985, 2000: 42; Moreno Cabrera 1998; Brinton & Traugott 2005; Willis 2007; Narrog & Heine 2021: 186 ff, to name but a few). Shedding light on lexicalization is important because it concerns the highly fixed, formulaic and routinized character of many areas of the language, discussed in point 7 above.

e) The second, and last, controversial aspect is the role of analogy in grammaticalization, because it is not at all clear whether it plays any role, in the sense of whether or not it is a possible mechanism of grammaticalization. In Narrog & Heine (2021: ch. 5), analogy is on an equal footing with reanalysis as mechanisms of grammaticalization, but it is understood as an extension of contexts and not in its traditional sense of a change from a model of proportions (Anttila 2003: 428; Hock 2003: 441). However, in the new *World lexicon of grammaticalization* (Kuteva et al. 2019) all the changes recorded in the source > target path (Appendix 1: 463-476) are recategorizations, i.e. reanalyses; the same is true of the earlier *World lexicon of grammaticalization* (Heine & Kuteva 2002), so it is not clear whether or not analogy is a mechanism of grammaticalization. The incorporation of analogy as a mechanism of grammaticalization is in line with some recent proposals to relax the concept of analogy to make it less restricted, by eliminating, for example, the postulation of 'model of proportions' and privileging the concepts of 'generalization', 'local extension' and 'extension of contexts', so that this type of change has application to a wider range of diachronic phenomena (Nørgård-Sørensen, Heltoft & Schøsler 2011: ch. 3; Joseph 2017; Company 2018). The research on analogy and syntax is important because it brings into focus a not minor aspect of grammar construction, namely the associative capacity of human beings, and what neurocognitive function the storage in paradigms and the pressure of paradigms has on the generation of grammars.

It is time to provide a definition of grammaticalization. For the operational purposes of this paper, I will understand by grammaticalization a processual and theoretical model of analysis of variation and change, which is well suited to functionalist theoretical postulates, which may comprise in its inner dynamics several changes, which acts, in general, through reanalysis or recategorizations, and which

may involve several directionalities: lexicon > grammar, syntax > morphology, core grammar > peripheral grammar, discourse > core grammar, core grammar > core grammar, etc. A grammaticalization is the fundamental cause of the creation of new categories in the language and of new pairings of form and meaning.

A grammaticalization is, as I understand it, a macro-change, because it affects form, function, distribution, meaning and frequency. *Form*: It usually impacts phonic form, eroding it and reducing the original phonetics; for example, the Latin prepositions *ad ~ ab* > preposition *a* 'to' in Spanish; phonic erosion is a characteristic but not obligatory feature. *Function*: It creates new functions and thus new categorial ascriptions, e.g. Latin pronoun *ille ~ illa* > Spanish article *el ~ la* 'the'. *Distribution*: It selects, therefore, new distributions: *mientras* 'while' a temporal form of simultaneity with indicative, *mientras Juan lee, Juana escribe* 'while John reads, Joan writes' > *mientras* 'while' conditional with subjunctive, *mientras no te comas la sopa, no sales a jugar* 'you can't go out to play until you finish your soup'. *Meaning:* It models new meanings and semantic nuances from the schematic etymological meaning, in a concrete > abstract process: *a* locative goal, *voy a México* 'I go to Mexico' > *a* transitivity meta, *veo a María* 'I see Mary'. *Frequency*: Finally, it impacts the frequency of use, from less frequent to more frequent; for example, the modal adjunct *a propósito* 'on purpose' with scope to the verb, *lo hizo a propósito* 'he/she did it on purpose', acquires a discursive function and therefore moves to the left margin, *A propósito, ¿qué opinas del problema* 'by the way, what do you think about the problem?'*,* a discursive function which, accumulated to the previous intrasentential one, increases the frequency of use of this prepositional phrase. The frequency can even increase exponentially since the use of a form or construction may become obligatory, as would be the well-known case of the auxiliarization of the Latin verb *habere* to form the compound tenses of the verbal paradigm in Spanish.

I adopt a broad concept of grammaticalization because, in my view, it is the language data itself and the specific type of syntactic problem that should decide the type of theoretical approach and the subtype or subtypes of grammaticalization – traditional grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, secondary grammaticalization, exaptation, capitalization, refunctionalization, etc. – that explain the syntactic-semantic change in question, if, indeed, it is a grammaticalization. Rather than committing myself to a certain theoretical position a priori and/or considering grammaticalization as a homogeneous theoretical model, I find it convenient to first let the language show its data, its variation, its continuities and discontinuities, and they together will tip the balance for an analysis and explanation in terms of a certain subtype of grammaticalization. My position differs substantially from that of Joseph (2014, 2021), who sets a priori restrictions on the concept of grammaticalization in order to keep it operational and thus avoid the risk that grammaticalization "risks to become the victim of its own success", as Breban et al. (2012: 2) pointed out more than a decade ago. In my view, grammaticalization, with its many approaches and nuances, remains a useful theoretical framework capable of relating seemingly unconnected diachronic phenomena, but the privilege lies in the language data and not in the theory.

In addition to this introduction, this paper is structured in five sections. In section 2, I state the hypothesis, define structural diachronic pattern, and briefly review whether this concept has been present in theoretical proposals on grammaticalization. Section 3 is devoted to exposing the diachronic phenomenon that serves as a case study to investigate the hypothesis. Section 4 analyzes and shows how a structural diachronic pattern can operate internally, i.e. within the same semantic field as the phenomenon in question. Section 5 analyzes similar changes coming from other grammatical fields which act as an external structural diachronic pattern. A brief conclusion closes in section 6.

The data come from the electronic corpora *Corpus Diacrónico del Español* (*CORDE*), *Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual* (*CREA*) – both of the Real Academia Española (<https://www.rae.es/>) –, the *Corpus Diacrónico y Diatópico del Español de América* (*CORDIAM*) of the Academia Mexicana de la Lengua and the Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (<https://www.cordiam.org/>), the *Corpus de la Sintaxis Histórica de la Lengua Española* (*CORPUS SHLE*) – a repository of texts in PDF for this work –, and *Google* searches.

2. Hypothesis. Grammaticalization and diachronic structural pattern

The hypothesis of this paper is that if a form or construction entering a process of grammaticalization, of whatever subtype, has a diachronic structural pattern, the grammaticalization of the form or construction in question may become entrenched and strengthened, so that it can recategorize and move easily into other grammatical areas, can make more complex diachronic paths, and will progress better than a change without a pattern. A diachronic pattern creates a pattern of change behaviour and is an incentive for the result to become conventionalized. This does not necessarily mean either chronological speed or obligatory use, although these two characteristics may also go hand in hand, depending on the phenomenon of change in question.

I understand by *pattern* a recurrent model or pattern of structural, formal and semantic behaviour, which displays a similar diachronic dynamic in several areas of the grammar, either in its own paradigm and/or semantic domain, or in other paradigms and in other semantic domains. I will call the first case *intraparadigmatic diachronic structural pattern*, and the second one, *interparadigmatic diachronic structural pattern*.

I take up the classical concept of *pattern* from structuralism; specifically, I start from Bloomfield's (1926) pioneering article "A Set of Postulates for the Science of Language", in which definitions 20, 33, 45 and 46 refer to "sound patterns" as settled and established orders and combinatorics as routines, and to the similarities and recurrences of such combinatorics that are repeated beyond the initial phonemes under consideration. The concept of *pattern* is also applied to recurrent combinatories in grammar, recurrence following a pattern (definition 23), and reappears in his book *Language* (1933: 31) as a habit of repetition of grammatical structures. The difference between this classical structuralist characterization and the one I propose here is that I add a diachronic angle not considered before.

As far as I know, the link between grammaticalization and diachronic pattern is not addressed in the specialized literature on that concept, perhaps because it is obvious, because it is (almost) a truism that a change with a strong diachronic pattern of support will have less difficulty to prosper than an isolated change. In fact, a pending research issue based on this hypothesis is to analyze, on the one hand, whether there are isolated changes and, on the other, whether there are degrees of strength of a pattern.

The hypothesis of this paper is not covered by Talmy's (1985: 57-58) concept of "lexicalization pattern", since this author defines *pattern* as "systematic relations between meaning and surface expressions", a definition quite close to Bloomfield's (1926), and looks for how the form-meaning pairing is codified, in a typological perspective, at three levels: "a wide variety of patterns, a comparatively small number of patterns or a single pattern (universal)".

The link between diachronic pattern and grammaticalization is also not foreseen in the traditional definition of this theoretical model: a lexical form or construction which, in certain contexts and distributions, assumes a grammatical function, or an already grammatical entity or construction which acquires, in certain contexts and distributions, an even more grammatical function (Kuryłowicz 1965; Heine, Claudi & Hünnemeyer 1991: ch. 1; Hopper & Traugott 2003: ch. 2; Company 2003; Lehmann 2015). Nor is it considered in the definition of grammaticalization as a fixation of discourse strategies or conventionalization of tendencies emerging from usage (Traugott 1989; Company 2012).

Nor do various theoretical developments and concepts of grammaticalization consider the notion of structural pattern, let alone that its existence supports a special diachronic behaviour. It is not mentioned in the works on grammaticalization understood as "emergent grammar" (Hopper 1987, 1998), "the emergence of grammatical systems" (Frajzyngier 2010) or "the emergence of language" (Smith 2011: 144), possibly because of its lack of specificity, since all change implies the "emergence" of something from previous lexical or grammatical matter. Nor does it appear in more specific proposals, such as Breban's (2014: 471) "secondary grammaticalization": "a later stage processes in grammaticalization", or in Givón's (1991) early concept of secondary grammaticalization: "the reanalysis of markers of one syntactic category into another one". Nor is the notion of pattern considered in the idea of "connecting grammaticalization": "chains of grammations, regrammations (transition from one grammatical status to another) and degrammations are seen as one connected process: change a is a precondition for b which again is a precondition for c and d" (Nørgård-Sørensen, Heltoft & Schøsler 2011: 5), although the idea of 'chained process' could in a sense be assimilated to that of pattern, albeit, in my hypothesis, I am not proposing that one change is a precondition for another. Nor is it in Lass's (1990) concepts and term 'exaptation' as 'junk or garbage morphemes acquire a new function', nor as 'conceptual invention, […] the model itself is what's new' (Lass 1997: 3, 18 ff.; Van de Velde & Norde 2016: 9). Nor does it appear in other developments associated with grammaticalization, such as "functional renewal" (Brinton & Stein 1995), "regrammaticalization" (Greenberg 1991), "refunctionalization" and "adfunctionalization" (Smith 2006),

all four of which are quite similar, in that they postulate that an old form reappears in the grammar with a new meaning and/or a new function. Nor, finally, is it in Pountain's (1997: 296) idea of "capitalization": "historical process by which a linguistic feature which already exists in a language comes to be substantially exploited for wider purposes".

3. A case study. The change predication > discourse marker > adjective

The change that serves as a basis for testing the hypothesis is the emergence of the discourse-pragmatic marker of evidentiality *dizque* from a predication and its subsequent incorporation into the core grammar as an adjective: *dice que vendrá* 'he/she says he/she will come' > *dizque son políticos* 'supposedly they are politicians' > *los dizque politicos* 'the supposed politicians'. I choose this change because of its empirical and theoretical peculiarity: it is common that a full predication, usually the verbal nucleus, broadens its scope and acquires discursive values, but it is not very common that once the new form arrives into the discourse, it again restricts its scope and returns to the core grammar maintaining the discursive value of the previous phase.[2]

Examples in (1) - (5) show the full diachronic process in a simplified manner. Examples in (1) display the predicative, transitive construction *dice que* 'he/she/it says / tells that', which constitutes the basis for the change; the meaning is transfer of information: a person says something which is explained in the following clause introduced by the conjunction *que* 'that' (subordinate clause is in italics in the examples). From very early times, the speech verb *dice* 'he/she/it says / tells' undergoes phonetic attrition – examples in (2) –, but only in the unmarked verb categories (3rd singular person indicative mood), maintaining the transfer of information meaning (subordinate clause is in italics). The main verb *diz* 'he/she/it says / tells' + the conjunction *que* 'that', *diz que* 'he/she/it says / tells that' underwent univerbation into *dizque* (3). Univerbation occurs exclusively in declarative sentences, and only when the two items are adjacent. The new word *dizque* at first maintains subordinate clause distribution in Medieval Spanish, as example in (3) shows (subordinate clause is in italics).[3] Later *dizque* evolved into an evidential-epistemic marker *dizque* 'supposedly', (4), close to a discourse adverb, having wide scope over the following whole predication contained in *dixe yo* 'I said that…' (4a), and in *eso dijo* 'he said that' (4b).[4] In (4) *dizque* functions at the left periphery, as an

---

2. In this section, I briefly outline the total diachronic path of this change; I take up a small part of the work of Company (in press); I refer to this article for an analysis of the grammaticalizations involved in the emergence of this form, the contexts that motivated them, the chronological stages, and the dialect manifestation.
3. The process is a lexical constructionalization (Hoffmann 2013: 309; Traugott & Trousdale 2013: 149-151): Two adjacent forms of a declarative sentence create a conventional pairing of form and meaning, giving rise to a new word, *dizque*.
4. In Eberenz's opinion (2004: 151-152), when the verb apocopated forms disappeared from Spanish (ca. the 16th century), *faz* 'does', *diz* 'says', *quier* 'wants', etc., the form *dizque* lost paradigmatic support and was specialized as a pragmatic-discourse form.

extraclausal form. The cooccurrence of *dizque* 'supposedly' and the same *dicendi* verb, *dixe* 'I said / told' and *dijo* 'he/she/it said / told' is a proof that *dizque* has no longer referential transfer meaning. Finally, the examples in (5) shows the last step of the diachronic process: the evidential-epistemic marker evolved into the adjective modifier *dizque* 'supposed', which now has a narrow scope over the nucleus of the noun phrase *ley* 'law' only (5a), *género* 'genre' (5b), or over the nucleus of the adjective phrase *decentes* 'decent' modifying the nucleus of the noun phrase *familias* 'families' (5c); *dizque* in (5) functions as an intraclausal form, more exactly, as an intraphrase structure form.

(1) a. Esplana mas ende maestre Godofre et **dize que** por ell entendimiento destos nombres Gog et Magog *que se entienden cosas contrapuestas* (Alfonso X, *General estoria. Cuarta parte*, 13th c., ca. 1280, *CORDE*)
'Master Godofre explains more about that, and says that because of these names, Gog and Magog, opposite things are understood.'

b. porque Oviedo **dice que** *vino el Almirante del dicho descubrimiento aquí a este puerto de Sancto Domingo* (Fray Bartolomé de las Casas, *Historia general de las Indias*, ca. 1560, Dominican Republic, *CORDIAM*)
'because Oviedo says that the Almirant of the mentioned discovery came to this harbour of Santo Domingo.'

c. Daniel **dice que** *la guerra estallará, que será sangrienta* (Juan Bautista Rivarola, *Yvypora*, 1970, Paraguay, *CORDE*)
'Daniel says that the war will burst, that it will be bloody.'

(2) a. Et otrosí o **diz que** *departiesen la luz de las tinieblas* sse entiende que departieron (Alfonso X, *Setenario*, ca. 1252-1270, *CORDE*)
'In addition, where [the prophet] says that the light must be separated from the darkness, it is understood that it occurred.'

b. Et si **diz que** *las cartas son falsas*, pues que leydas son en cort, deue luego prender la iusticia las cartas (Municipal code, *Fuero de Tudela*, ca. 1250, *CORDE*)
'And if the judge says that the letters are false, then, once they are read in court, immediately the Justice must take the letters.'

(3) E tal postura **dizque** *auien* que luego que nascie y el ninno que luegol ponien en quitaçion (Anonymous author, *Gran conquista de ultramar*, 13th c., 1293, *CORDE*)
'And from such an agreement, it is said that as soon as a child was born, they would immediately put him into service.'

(4) a. y me levantó testimonio que **dizque** *dixe* yo quándo dizen los artículos en la iglesia… (Legal document, 1537, Mexico, *CORDIAM*)
'and he raised me a false accusation that dizque-supposedly I said something about ecclesiastic commandments.'

    b. "Ya no puedo estar contigo, Natalia. Ayúdame a estar contigo", **dizque**
        eso le *dijo* (Juan Rulfo, *El llano en llamas*, 1953, Mexico, *CORDE*)
        '"I cannot to be with you, Natalia. Help me to be with you," supposedly
        he said that.'

(5) a. los transeúntes viles, amparados por **la dizque ley**, solían correr tras el
          ladrón (Fernando Vallejo, *La virgen de los sicarios*, 1994, Peru, *CREA*)
          'vile people, protected by the supposed-bad law, used to run behind the
          thief.'

      b. Tantas novelas sobre la ciudad ¿no? hasta parece que se ha convertido **en
          un dizque género: novela urbana**. Hazme el serenado favor (María Luisa
          Puga, *La forma del silencio*, 1987, Mexico, *CORDE*)
          'So many romances about the city… It looks like a supposed new text
          genre. Please.'

      c. *Las familias* **dizque decentes** andan desesperadas (Arturo Azuela, *El
          tamaño del infierno*, 1973, Mexico, *CORDE*)
          'Families supposed(ly) decent are desperate.'

     In using *dizque* 'supposedly, allegedly' / 'supposed, alleged', the speaker doubts
the source of the information, they believe that the information is hearsay, they
think that the event is false, or they disqualify the essential referential features of the
modified nominal (noun or adjective). The two processes, (1) > (4) and (4) > (5), are
reanalyses. The speech verb *dice* 'he/she/it says / tells' of the main sentence plus the
complementizer *que* 'that' introducing the subordinate clause are recategorized as
an evidential-epistemic pragmatic marker, *dizque*, which is later recategorized as an
evidential-epistemic adjective, modifying nouns and adjectives. Thus, the progres-
sion is: 1. verb construction > 2. pragmatic marker > 3. nominal modifier. As it is
common in language change, both the full verb construction *dice que* 'he/she/it says
/ tells that', the evidential-epistemic discourse marker *dizque* 'supposedly' and the
evidential-epistemic adjective *dizque* 'supposed' coexist in present-day Spanish,
because syntactic change is cumulative.
     Diachronic attestations of the changes give support to the chronology of both
reanalyses: (1) they exist in Spanish from very early times, they function as a full
speech verb construction in all periods, inherited from Latin; (2) they appear from
the beginning of 16th century onward, and (3) they are attested from the beginning
of the 20th century onward.
     The two changes are different as regards directionality and scope. The first one
represents an upgrading in the predicative sequence: sentence grammar > discourse
grammar; the second one is a downgrading or reinsertion in sentence grammar:
discourse grammar > sentence grammar. The first change is a paradigmatic prag-
maticalization, because besides the upgrading in the cline sentence > discourse, the
new evidential-epistemic marker *dizque* 'supposedly' acquires a broad scope over
the whole sentence, and also acquires a discourse-pragmatic subjective meaning
(Arnovick 1999: 96; Kaltenböck, Heine & Kuteva 2011; Heine et al. 2013, 2021;

Narrog & Heine 2021: ch. 4, and many others). The second change is a grammaticalization, quite puzzling, because it is not predicted by the current theoretical literature about grammaticalization.[5] Both changes are grammaticalizations, as I characterized it in section 1 of this paper.

The long and complex progression of (1) - (5) was possible because this type of change has a strong diachronic structural pattern, both intraparadigmatic and interparadigmatic: on the one hand, the change was supported by the dynamism of the verb *decir* 'to say / to tell' to weaken its referential meaning of information transmission and acquire diverse discursive values; on the other hand, the change was supported by other grammatical areas of Spanish which underwent the same circular process from core grammar to discourse grammar and back again to core grammar while maintaining the previously acquired discursive value. The intraparadigmatic pattern is support for the first grammaticalization of *dizque*, going to peripheral or discourse grammar, while the interparadigmatic pattern is support for the second grammaticalization of *dizque*, going to core grammar.

4. Intraparadigmatic diachronic structural pattern

In typological perspective it is well known that language verbs are a highly dynamic semantic category, as they are easily recategorized into discourse-pragmatic markers of various kinds that exhibit a rich array of procedural meanings, including evidentiality (Heine & Kuteva 2002: 261-269; Kuteva et al. 2019: 375-387). The verb *decir* 'to say / to tell' is an example of this dynamism, a dynamism that acts as an intraparadigmatic structural diachronic pattern for the grammaticalization of *dic(e) que* 'he/she/it says / tells that' > *dizque* 'supposedly' is to be accomplished.

At least three changes, with various manifestations within them, experienced by this verb go in the same diachronic line of *dizque* weakening of the referential meaning of information transmission and acquisition of discourse-pragmatic values. The path of weakening-loss of syntactic capacities > discourse-pragmatic enrichment was made possible by three procedures: *a*) the subject entity, which is the agent responsible for conveying information, is weakened or missing from the predication, so that there is no one to convey any information; *b*) the verb form is immobilized in person, number, tense and mood, which is proof that the verb has weakened its grammatical capacity; *c*) in some changes, some other word is attached to the verb, a residue of the verb's original syntactic ability, so that a grammaticalization

---

5. Downgrading is, in fact, the expected directionality in traditional grammaticalization (Haspelmath 2004; Börjars & Vincent 2011), but this kind of downgrading coming from the discourse is not covered by traditional grammaticalization. For instance, it is not registered in the *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization* (Heine & Kuteva 2002), nor in the new *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization* (Kuteva et al. 2019), or in the works collected in *Up and down the Cline. The Nature of Grammaticalization* (Fischer, Norde & Perridon 2004), nor in the works collected in *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization* (Narrog & Heine 2011), nor in the works collected in *Refining Grammaticalization* (Von Mengden & Simon 2014), nor in the recent textbook *Grammaticalization* (Narrog & Heine 2021).

of construction takes place with a (quasi)formulaic result. The three changes that constitute a pattern were the following:

1. *Quotative metalinguistic use*. The verb *decir* 'to say / to tell' appears fixed in the third person indicative, *dice* 'he/she/it says / tells', and serves to cite the information that follows, *aquí dice "perejil"* 'here it says parsley', as in (6a). It has corrective or reformulative variants; among others, the one used in errata, typical of legal documents, *ó diz… non enpesca* 'where it says… it does not hinder' (6b), *donde dice… debe decir…* 'where it says… should read' (6c), which has been substantivized and fossilized as a legal formula, *el dice y el debe decir* 'says and should say', or the one used in translations of scientific treatises, *donde dice… quiere decir…* 'where he says…which means' *(*6d). In these uses there is no subject, so no one transfers information, it is an impersonal use of *decir* 'to say / to tell' with a metadiscursive value. The introductory adverbs of these expressions, *aquí* 'here' in (6a), *ó* 'where' in (6b) and *donde* 'where' in (6cd), locate the zone of quotation and confirm the metalinguistic use of the verb, already distanced from its etymological referential meaning.

(6) a.   —**Aquí dice aplausos**. —Pero es un aplauso entre paréntesis, para que usted sepa que van a aplaudir (Eloy Herrera, *Un cero a la izquierda*, 1976, Spain, CREA)
'—Here it says applause. —But it is an applause in brackets, so that you know that they will applaud.'

   b.   e entre rrenglones **ó diz** "mayor del rregno de Murçia", e sobre rraydo **ó diz** "manda", non le enpesca (Anonymous, Judicial process initiated by the council and town of Ávila, 1415, CORDE)
'among lines where it says "mayor of the kingdom of Murcia", and over scraped where it says "commands", it does not hinder.'

   c.   en foja 18 **donde dice** "cópiese" **debe decir** "instrúyase" (Legal document, Mexico City, 1981, Mexico, CORPUS SHLE)
'on page 18, where it says "copy" should read "instruct".'

   d.   Esto es lo que defiende Avicena en la fen cuarta del primero, **donde dice**: "et cabe tibi ne transitus", etc., que **quiere decir**: "cuida que no se haga traspasamiento sobre miembro noble" (Diego Álvarez Chanca, *Tratado no menos útil que necesario…*, 1506, Spain, CORDE)
'This is what Avicenna defends in the fourth section of the first, where he says: "et cabe tibi ne transitus", etc., which means: "take care that there is no trespassing on a noble member".'

2. *Depersonalized and impersonal use*. The verb *decir* 'to say / to tell' may appear fixed in the third person plural, *dicen* 'they say', to indicate that the agent of the action is unknown or, better, that it is unimportant and, therefore, it is not worth the effort to find out or express it, (7). It preserves part of the argumentative structure, since it maintains the completive of direct object introduced

by *que* 'that', which is a support for the form *dizque*. The use of *decir* 'to say / to tell' in the third plural is so impersonal that the real agent could be one or several persons, because it does not matter, or it is not known, whether it is one or several persons at the same time who *dicen* 'say'. It is a resource frequently employed in the lyrical and storytelling tradition, as a mechanism of popular appropriation of what is expressed, as can be seen in (7b). A closely related use, with other syntactic and semantic edges due to the presence of the clitic *se*, which operates as a pattern for *dizque*, is the impersonal *se dice* 'it is said' (7c).

(7) a.   Yo ya me veo quajada de angustias de este encierro funésto, y trastornada con el sústo de que **dicen que** ayer tembló (Letters between individuals, 1806, Colombia, *CORDIAM*)
            'I already feel overwhelmed with anguish from this fateful confinement, and troubled by the fright, because they say (that) there was an earthquake yesterday.'

     b.   **Dicen que** por las noches / nomas se le iba en puro llorar, / **dicen que** no dormía / nomas se le iba en puro tomar (Tomás Méndez, *Cucurrucucú paloma*, 1954, Mexico, *GOOGLE*)
            'They say that at night / all she did was cry, / they say she didn't sleep / all she did was drink.'

     c.   No en balde **se dice que** vale más un día del hombre discreto que toda la vida del necio y simple (Fernando de Rojas, *La Celestina*, 1499-1502, Spain, *CORDE*)
            'It is not for nothing that it is said that a day of a discreet man is worth more than the whole life of a foolish and simple man.'

3. *Subjective and intersubjective uses of the evaluation of the predication*. The verb *decir* 'to say / to tell', fixed in certain tenses and persons, usually constructed with some other word, *digo (yo)* 'I guess', *ya decía yo* 'I thought so', *y que lo digas* 'you said it!', *es decir* 'that is to say', *como se suele decir* 'as they say', etc., may appear in parenthetical positions or at the end of a narrative of which, supposedly, *decir* 'to say / to tell' would be the regent verb (8). The syntactic relationality of the verb with the preceding or subsequent sentence(s) is totally weakened and, in fact, in many cases the main-subordinate relationship is inverted, since the main information is contained in the subordinate while *decir* 'to say / to tell' functions as a mere evaluative expression with respect to what is stated or with respect to the interaction of the speaker with the interlocutor. The verbal form in these cases has a discursive pragmatic value, it is a discourse marker far from the etymological value of transmitting information. Thompson (2002: 137-138) calls this type of usage "stance formulas" and "reusable schemas" and considers them similar in their discourse-pragmatic function to epistemic adverbs. The examples in (8b-f) are taken from Barraza (2014: §25.9), to whom I refer for a detailed analysis of the discourse values of the various formulas with *decir* 'to say / to tell'.

(8) a. —Los gringos, esos sí son rígidos y secos, ni saludan. —**Ya decía yo**. (Spontaneous speech, Mexico, 2024)
'The gringos, those are really stiff and dry, they don't even say hello. —I thought so.'

   b. Este asunto de las ayudas debe de ser un producto del momento, debe de ser una moda, **digo yo** (*La ratonera*, 2002, Spain, CREA)
'This issue of aid must be a product of the moment, it must be a fad, I guess.'

   c. Era un odio (**como suele decirse**) vatiniano el que a toda la familia tenía el pueblo (Antonio de Fuenmayor, *Vida y hechos*, 1595, Spain, CORDE)
'It was a Vatinian hatred (as they say) that the people had for the whole family.'

   d. —¿Tienes novia? (fingiendo indiferencia). —Novia, **lo que se dice** novia…, no (Benito Pérez Galdós, *Miau*, 1888, Spain, CORDE)
'—Do you have a girlfriend? (feigning indifference). —Girlfriend, what you call a girlfriend…, no.'

   e. Yo nunca he tenido un padre, **como quien dice**. Mis padres se separaron cuando yo tenía nueve años y me internaron en un colegio (*Tiempo*, 09-11-1990, Spain, CREA)
'I never had a father, as it were. My parents separated when I was nine years old, and they sent me to a boarding school.'

   f. —Y yo, ¿tú qué te crees? Cuando digo los nuestros quiero decir la fetén, vamos, que eres de fiar, que no estás aquí por nadie más que por nosotros. —Eso **y que lo digas** (José Luis Martín Virgil, *Los curas comunistas*, 1968, Spain, CORDE)
'—And me, what do you think? When I say "our people", I mean "the real deal", that is, that you're trustworthy, that you're not here for anyone but us. —You said it!'

The three changes outlined here act as a solid intraparadigmatic structural pattern or model that made possible the grammaticalization of the predication *dic(e) que* 'he/she/it says / tells that' > *dizque* as an evidential discourse marker, devoid of both the etymological referential value of conveying information of *dice* 'he/she/it says / tells' and from the etymological value of complementing the conjunction *que* 'that'. In turn, of course, the grammaticalization of *dizque* acts as a pattern to strengthen the depersonalization and discursivization of the other changes of *decir* 'to say / to tell'. In short, an interactional pattern that facilitates the acquisition of discourse-pragmatic values on the part of the verb *decir* 'to say / to tell'.

Given that the syntactic change is cumulative, as I have already pointed out, all the changes and phases experienced by the verb *decir* 'to say / to tell' coexist in current Spanish: verb *decir* 'to say / to tell' and lexical direct object + verb *decir* 'to say / to tell' and completive subordinate of direct object + discourse markers with varying degrees of referential weakening and grammaticalization, *dizque* among them + adjective *dizque*.

5. Interparadigmatic diachronic structural pattern

The diachronic path predication > discourse marker > adjective, followed by *dizque*, with two grammaticalizations, has a pattern outside the semantic domain of the verb *decir* 'to say / to tell'. This interparadigmatic structural pattern acted as a model for the completion of the second grammaticalization of *dizque*, and undoubtedly strengthened the first grammaticalization or pragmaticalization of *dice que* 'he/she/it says / tells that'> *dizque*. In turn, the double grammaticalization of *dizque* is a guideline to strengthen the other changes that share this double diachronic process.

Three grammatical zones of Spanish not ascribed to *dicendi* verbs display the same path of circular change of leaving the core grammar to the peripheral grammar and returning to the core grammar while maintaining the semantic-pragmatic value acquired in the peripheral grammar. The three changes are: 1. predication *que es que* > discourse marker *quesque* > adjective *quesque*; 2. verbal nucleus of predication *vaya* > discourse marker *vaya* > adjective *vaya*; 3. predication *puede que* > discourse marker *pue'que ~ pueque* > adjective *puede que*. The first two changes consummated the process just as *dizque* did, the third has documentations with adjective distribution but is a peculiar case of reinsertion into the core grammar.

The process of grammaticalization in the three changes is the same as that undergone by *dizque*: *a*) fixation in a person and verb tense; *b*) loss of the original status of predication; *c*) univerbation in the changes involving several items of the predication (changes 1 and 3); *d*) widening of the scope of modification; *e*) fixation in the initial position or left margin of its sentence; *f*) consequent acquisition of discourse marker values; *g*) reinsertion into the core grammar by narrowing the scope of the modification, now as an evaluative adjective which modifies a nominal and which has strong distribution restrictions, since it is always situated, like *dizque*, in the left margin of the nominal nucleus which it modifies and needs to be preceded by another modifier in the left margin of the nominal phrase, generally a determiner. The mechanism is a double reanalysis. Let us look at the three changes that constitute a pattern:

1. *The double grammaticalization of* quesque. The examples in (9) show the diachronic path experienced by this form. A complex predication with the intransitive verb *ser* 'to be', always in the third person singular of the present indicative, *es* 'he/she/it is' – again, the unmarked categories of the verb –, example in (9a), undergoes a univerbation with a double phonic fusion, relative pronoun + verb + conjunction, (9b). The new word *quesque* operates as an evidential discourse marker, since with it the speaker casts doubt on the predicate in the event, as can be seen in (9b); it has at this stage a value close to *supuestamente* 'supposedly' or *lo dudo mucho* 'I doubt it very much', a value almost identical to that of the evidential marker *dizque*. In (9c) and (9d) the word *quesque* has returned to core grammar, with a restricted scope over the nominal which follows, now reanalyzed as an evaluative adjective by which the speaker questions or disqualifies the referential property of the nominal in question, *carece de hombría* 'lacks manhood' (9c), *carece de la propiedad de un detective* 'lacks the property of a detective' (9d). The proof that *quesque* has been recategorized as an adjective is

that it enters a new adjective paradigm, a mechanism known as *paradigmatiza-tion* (Lehmann 2015: ch. 4). In this last phase of its diachronic journey, *quesque* is commutable with other adjectives of similar meaning; as can be seen in the examples in (10), one of these adjectives being *dizque*.

(9) a. que es lo que arriba está dicho, **que es que** le dieron copal y papel para hacer sus encantamientos (Legal document, 1537, Mexico, CORDIAM)
'which is what is said above, which is that they gave him copal and paper to make his incantations.'

b. El primer día que fuimos, **quesque** a posar, como dicen, fue, ora verá usté, el lunes (Eladia González, *Quién como dios*, 1999, Mexico, CREA)
'The first day we went, supposedly to pose, as they say, it was on Monday.'

c. **El quesque muy hombre de mi padre** temblaba de muina (Gabriel Velasco, *Los dioses son caprichosos*, 2004, Mexico, *googlebooks*)
'The supposed manliness of my father was shaking with rage.'

d. ya sabemos que **esos tipos quesque detectives** pa lo único que sirven es pa seguir matrimonios ponecuernos y párele de contar (Rafael Ramírez Heredia, *Rayo Macoy*, 1984, Mexico, CREA)
'we already know that those so-called detectives are only good for following cheating spouses, and that's about it.'

(10) a. el **quesque** hombre / esos tipos **quesque** detectives
'the supposed man / those supposed detectives.'

b. el **aparente** hombre / esos tipos **aparentes** detectives
'the supposed man / those supposed detective guys.'

c. el **supuesto** hombre / esos tipos **supuestos** detectives
'the supposed man / those supposed detectives.'

d. el **dizque** hombre / esos tipos **dizque** detectives
'the so-called man / those so-called detective guys.'

2. *The double grammaticalization of* vaya. This change, analyzed by Octavio (2001-2002) and described by this author as "a round trip", shows the same process of double grammaticalization of *dizque*. The verb *ir* 'to go' in (11a) encodes displacement towards a goal and, therefore, maintains the etymological referential meaning of movement, as evidenced by the presence of a volitional subject that moves, *él* 'he', and the explicit goal of the movement, *a estos rrey-nos* 'to these kingdoms' (both highlighted in italics). In (11b), the verb form fixed in the third person singular of the present subjunctive, *vaya* 'he goes', is placed in the left margin of the predication, there is no longer any displacement, it is now a discourse marker indicating surprise with respect to what is reported 'well!'. The original verbal nucleus *vaya* has been reanalyzed and undergoes a grammaticalization, namely a pragmaticalization. In (11c) the form *vaya* has

returned to the core grammar, it now has an adjective function and modifies the noun it follows 'what a', it has narrowed the scope of the modification; it is an intensive adjective. The proof of the categorial status of adjective of *vaya* is that it paradigmatized with the intensive adjective *qué* 'what a', as seen in the minimal pairs of (12). A second reanalysis and a second grammaticalization therefore took place, just as with *dizque*.

(11) a. de más desto cumple al serviçio de vuestra majestat que *él* **vaya** *a estos rreynos* para platicar sobre algun descubrjmijento de la mar del sur (Administrative document, 1537, Guatemala, *CORDIAM*)
'furthermore, it is appropriate for the service of your majesty that he goes to these kingdoms to discuss some discovery of the South Sea.'

   b. ¡**Vaya**, pues no hay pan! ¡Qué se le va a hacer! (Francisco Nieva, *La señora tártara*, 1980, Spain, *CREA*)
'Well, there is no bread! What can you do?'

   c. Joder tía, **vaya noche**, qué ruina (Juan José Alonso Millán, *Pasarse de la raya*, 1991, Spain, *CREA*)
'Damn, girl, what a night, what a mess.'

(12) a. Joder tía, **qué noche** / **qué cochazo**
'Damn, girl, what a night / what a big car.'

   b. Joder tía, **vaya noche** / **vaya cochazo**
'Damn, girl, what a night / what a big car.'

3. *A double grammaticalization of* puede que *'may that'?* The verb *poder* 'may' functions as a full transitive verb taking a completive direct object sentence introduced by *que* 'that', as in (13): the respective subjects of (13a) and (13b) *el paseo de moda…* 'the fashionable walk…' and *Escafamiranda* 'Escafamiranda', as well as the respective direct object sentences *que tenga una brizna de…* 'may well have a hint of…' (13a) and *que haya participado…* 'may have participated' (13b) are highlighted in italics. Immobilized, the verb in the third person singular of the present indicative – once again the unmarked verb categories – undergoes phonic erosion, a common process in grammaticalization, and together with the conjunction undergoes univerbation, *pueque* 'may that' (13cd). The new word has weakened the original syntactic framework of the verb *poder* 'may': *pueque* 'may thay' is always placed at the beginning of the predication, it widens its scope, a typical feature of a pragmaticalization, it is no longer possible to identify any subject and the new form has the subjective evaluative meaning of pondering what is referred to in the following predication (13cd).[6] The exam-

---

6. There seems to be a residue of the argumental structure of the verb, since the following predication could be interpreted as subject, although it is not clear, since if two predications were coordinated, for example, *te suelte dos hostias y te deje de hablar* 'I might just give you a couple of smacks and stop talking to you' in (13c), the form *pueque* remains invariable, unable to display number agreement; the same invariableness has *puede que* 'may that'. In rural Castilian Spanish of Salamanca

ples in (13ef) show the distribution of *puede que* 'may that' as an adjective: it is embedded in an adjective phrase, *puede que más divertido* 'possibly most fun' (13e)*, puede que más raros* 'possibly strangest' (13f), which, preceded by a determiner, modifies the core noun of the sentence; *puede que* 'may that' is now embedded in a sentence syntax, and it is the whole noun phrase which has syntactic function in the predication, subject function in (13ef), as indicated by the singular or plural agreement of (13e) and (13f), respectively.

One "oddity" of this reinsertion is that it is *puede que* 'may that', without univerbation, the form which displays this adjective distribution and which brings the evaluative subjective meaning to the whole noun phrase, which is logical, moreover, because it is a modal verb involved, a fact which, in turn, indicates that *puede que* 'may that' is not far removed from the original modal value and proof, possibly, that the grammaticalization of *puede que* 'may that' is not so advanced. The diachronic syntax of the circular path of *puede que* 'may that' is a phenomenon that requires further investigation. Suffice it now for the aim of this paper to point out that *puede que* 'may that' follows the same double diachronic path as *dizque, quesque* and *vaya*, although it does not seem to have consummated its reinsertion into the core grammar as clearly as these three modifying words of a nominal do. All four changes coincide in their origin in predications that became discourse markers and returned as adjectives to the syntax of the noun phrase.

(13) a. *El paseo de moda a la Capilla*, cerca del hospital y del manicomio y del anfiteatro, **puede que** en el fondo *tenga una brizna de esa apasionada religión de la muerte* (Miguel Ángel Asturias, *Oh, los ataúdes*, 1930, Guatemala, CORDE)
'The fashionable walk to the Chapel, near the hospital and the asylum and the amphitheater, may well have a hint of that passionate religion of death.'

b. *Escafamiranda* **puede que** *haya participado en esa batalla* (Miguel Ángel Asturias, *Maladrón*, 1969, Guatemala, CORDE)
'Escafamiranda may have participated in that battle.'

c. Testás poniendo un poco cansinote, si sigues así **pueque** te suelte dos hostias (La Mancha Today, *Diccionario español-manchego*, 2018, Spain, *Google*)
'You're getting a bit annoying; if you keep it up, I might just give you a couple of smacks.'

d. si nos ponemos a trabajar en paz, **pueque** pronto quiten el acordonamiento al pueblo (Felipe Santander, *Y, el milagro*, 1984, Mexico, CREA)
'if we start working peacefully, they might soon remove the cordoning off of the town.'

---

e. **El puede que más divertido e interesante evento del año en España**
llegará muy pronto (Radio advertising, 2022, Spain)
'The possibly most fun and interesting event of the year in Spain will arrive
very soon.'

f. **Los puede que más raros modelos de coches** llegarán a sus TV
(Television advertising, 2022, Spain)
'The possibly strangest car models will arrive on your TV.'

The bottom line is that three changes outside the semantic domain of *dicendi* verbs show the same double grammaticalization of *dizque*: grammaticalization 1 = core grammar > discourse + grammaticalization 2 = discourse > intraphrase nominal core grammar, with a successive widening and narrowing of the scope of the modification and a correspondingly different distribution in each grammaticalization.

All three act as a strong interparadigmatic diachronic structural pattern for the conventionalization of the double path of *dizque*: discourse marker plus adjective. In turn, *dizque* also acts as a diachronic structural pattern for these three changes to complete their circular path. Given the cumulative nature of syntactic change, all the stages of the complex process coexist in present-day Spanish: predication + marker + adjective.

A final result is, likewise, that *dizque* is integrated into a paradigm of evidential and evaluative forms that come from the predication + conjunction scheme: changes 1 and 3, *dizque*, *quesque* and *pueque*, by means of which the speaker evaluates the event or the nominal referred to, either to question it and eliminate its properties, with *dizque* and *quesque*, or to ponder the effect of what is being predicated or to highlight and weigh the features of the modified nominal, with *pueque ~ puede que*.

6. Conclusions

I hypothesized that a change with a strong diachronic structural pattern can be better anchored in the grammar than an isolated change. To this end, I have shown a case study to test the hypothesis, namely the circular diachrony undergone by the predication *dic(e) que* 'he/she/it says / tells that' until it became a discourse marker of evidentiality *dizque* 'supposedly' and subsequently attained the status of adjective, with maintenance of the evidential value acquired on its way to discourse.

I have argued that this complex double path of first widening and then narrowing the scope of predication, that is, a move out of core grammar into discourse grammar and a return to core grammar, was made possible by the existence of two diachronic structural patterns consisting of changes similar to those experienced by the *dic(e) que* 'he/she/it says / tells that: an intraparadigmatic structural pattern, within the semantic domain of the verb *decir* 'to say / to tell', and an interparadigmatic structural pattern, outside the semantic domain of the *dicendi* verbs.

As theoretical coordinates to frame the hypothesis, at the beginning of the paper I set out twenty theoretical aspects of language and variation, all relating to how gram-

maticalization has shed light on language and its dynamics of change. I have also pointed out some gaps and problematic aspects in research on grammaticalization. I have provided a broad definition of grammaticalization, which privileges the historical data of a language rather than an a priori theory devoid of empirical support.

References

Anttila, Raimo. 2003. Analogy: The warp and woof of cognition. In Joseph, Brian D. & Janda, Richard D. (eds.). *The handbook of historical linguistics*, 425-440. Malden-Oxford: Blackwell.

Arnovick, Leslie K. 1999. *Diachronic pragmatics. Seven case studies in English illocutionary development*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Barraza Carbajal, Georgina. 2014. Oraciones subordinadas sustantivas de objeto directo. In Company, Concepción (dir.). *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española. Tercera parte: Adverbios, preposiciones y conjunciones. Relaciones interoracionales*, 2791-3106. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México/Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1926. A set of postulates for the science of language. *Language* 2(3): 153-164.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Börjars, Kersti & Nigel, Vincent. 2011. Grammaticalization and directionality. In Narrog, Heiko & Heine, Bernd (eds.). *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*, 163-176. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Breban, Tine. 2014. What is secondary grammaticalization? Trying to see the wood for the trees in a confusion of interpretations. In von Mengden, Ferdinand & Simon, Herbert (eds.). *Refining grammaticalization*, 469-502. Special issue of *Folia Linguistica*.

Breban, Tine, Vanderbiesen, Jeroen, Davidse, Kristin, Brems, Liesolette & Mortelmans, Tanja. 2012. Introduction. New reflections on the sources, outcomes, defining features and motivations of grammaticalization. In *Grammaticalization and language change. New reflections*, 1-35. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Brinton, Laurel & Dieter, Stein. 1995. Functional renewal. In Andersen, Hening (ed.). *Historical Linguistics 1993: Selected papers from the 11th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, 33-47. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Brinton, Laurel J. & Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2005. *Lexicalization and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Company Company, Concepción. 2003. La gramaticalización en la historia del español. In Company, Concepción (ed.). *Gramaticalización y cambio sintáctico en la historia del español*, 1-62. Special issue of *Medievalia*.

Company Company, Concepción. 2012. Historical morphosyntax and grammaticalization. In Hualde, José I., Olarrea, Antxon & O'Rourke, Erin (eds.). *Handbook of Hispanic linguistics*, 673-693. London/New York: Blackwell.

Company Company, Concepción. 2018. Analogía inducida por contexto. La extensión de la preposición *a* en la historia del español. *Revista de Historia de la Lengua Española* 13: 31-51.

Company Company, Concepción. 2019. Grammatical words and spreading of contexts. Their status in Grammaticalization theory. Evidence from the Spanish preposition

a 'to'. In Garachana, Mar & Nieuwenhuijsen, Dorien (eds.). *Studies in linguistics and language change. Grammaticalization, refunctionalization and beyond*. Special issue of *Languages* 4(10): 1-16.

Company Company, Concepción. 2022. The role of context and distribution in the grammaticalization of the Spanish speech verb *decir* 'to say / to tell' into *dizque* 'supposedly / supposed'. In Pardal, Alberto & Garzón, Evelin (eds.). *Verbs of though and speech. Pragmaticalization paths across languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Eberenz, Rolf. 2004. *Dizque*: antecedentes medievales de un arcaísmo afortunado. *Lexis* 28(1-2): 139-156.

Fischer, Olga, Norde, Muriel & Perridon, Harry (eds.). 2004. *Up and down the cline. The nature of grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Frajzynger, Zygmunt. 2010. Grammaticalization within and outside of a domain. In van Linden, An, Verstraete, Jean Christophe & Davidse, Kristin (eds.). *Formal evidence in grammaticalization research*, 43-62. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy. 1971. Historical syntax and synchronic morphology. In *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 394-415. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Givón, Talmy. 1991. The evolution of dependent clause morpho-syntax in Biblical Hebrew. In Traugott, Elisabeth C. & Heine, Bernd (eds.). *Approaches to grammaticalization (vol. 2): Types of grammatical markers*, 257-310. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gómez Seibane, Sara. 2018. Gramaticalización, modalización y contacto: *y así* en dos variedades de español. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación* 75: 155-172.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1991. The last stages of grammatical elements: Contractive an expansive desemanticization. In Traugott, Elisabeth C. & Heine, Bernd (eds.). *Approaches to grammaticalization (vol. 1): Theoretical and methodological issues*, 301-314. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. In Fischer, Olga, Norde, Muriel & Perridon, Harry (eds.). *Up and down the cline. The nature of grammaticalization*, 17-44. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Heine, Bernd, Claudi, Ulrike & Hünnemeyer, Friedericke. 1991. *Grammaticalization. A conceptual framework*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heine, Bernd, Kaltenböck, Gunther, Kuteva, Tania & Long, Haiping. 2013. An outline of discourse grammar. In Shannon, Claude (ed.). *Functional approaches to language*, 155-206. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Heine, Bernd, Kaltenböck, Gunther, Kuteva, Tania & Long, Haiping. 2021. *On the rise of discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hock, Hans Henrich. 2003. Analogical change. In Joseph, Brian D. & Janda, Richard D. (eds.). *The handbook of historical linguistics*, 441-460. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hoffmann, Thomas. 2013. Abstract phrasal and clausal constructions. In Hoffman, Thomas & Trousdale, Graeme (eds.). *The Oxford handbook of construction grammar*, 307-328. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hopper, Paul. 1987. Emergent grammar. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 13: 139-157.

Hopper, Paul. 1998. Emergent grammar. In Tomasello, Michael (ed.). *The new psychology of language. Cognitive and functional approaches to language structure*, 155-175. New Jersey: LEA.

Hopper, Paul J. & Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Joseph, Brian D. 2014. What counts as (an instance of) grammaticalization? In von Mengden, Ferdinand & Simon, Herbert (eds.). *Refining grammaticalization*, 361-384. Special issue of *Folia Linguistica*.

Joseph, Brian D. 2017. Analogy as local generalization: The solution to (almost) all our problems. Paper read in the *23rd International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. San Antonio, Texas.

Joseph, Brian D. 2021. Some observations on what grammaticalization is and is not. *Cadernos de Linguística* 2: 1-21.

Kaltenböck, Gunther, Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2011. On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language* 35(4): 848-893.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1965. The evolution of grammatical categories. In Kuryłowicz, Jerzy (ed.). *Esquisses linguisiques II*, 23-35. München: Wilhelm Fink.

Kuteva, Tania, Heine, Bernd, Hong, Bo, Long, Haiping, Narrog, Heiko & Rhee, Seongha. 2019. *World lexicon of grammaticalization* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lass, Roger. 1990. How to do things with junk: Exaptation in language evolution. *Journal of Linguistics* 26: 79-102.

Lass, Roger. 1997. *Historical linguistics and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lehmann, Christian. 2015. *Thoughts on grammaticalization* (3rd edition). Berlin: Language Science Press.

Meillet, Antoine. 1912. L'evolution des formes grammaticales. In Antoine Meillet (ed.). *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*, 130-149. Paris: Edouard Champion.

Moreno Cabrera, Juan Carlos. 1998. On the relationships between grammaticalization and lexicalization. In Giacalonne Ramat, Anna & Hopper, Paul J. (eds.). *The limits of grammaticalization*, 211-227. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Narrog, Heiko & Heine, Bernd. 2011. *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Narrog, Heiko & Heine, Bernd. 2021. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nørgård-Sørensen, Jens, Heltoft, Lars & Schøsler, Lene. 2011. *Connecting grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Octavio de Toledo y Huerta, Álvaro S. 2001-2002. ¿Un viaje de ida y vuelta? La gramaticalización de *vaya* como marcador y cuantificador. *Anuari de Filologia* (11-12): 47-72.

Pountain, Christopher J. 1997. Capitalization. In Smith, John C. & Bentley, Delia (eds.). *Historical Linguistics 1995*: *General issues and non-Germanic languages*, vol. 1, 295-309. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Smith, John Charles. 2006. How to do things without junk. The refunctionalization of a pronominal subsystem between Latin and Romance. In Nishida, Chiyo & Montreuil,

Jean-Pierre (eds.). *New perspectives on Romance linguistics: Phonetics, phonology and dialectology*, vol. 2, 183-205. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Smith, Andrew D. M. 2011. Grammaticalization and language evolution. In Narrog, Heiko & Heine, Bernd (eds.). *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*, 142-152. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Talmy, Leonard. 1985. Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms. In Shopen, Timothy (ed.). *Language typology and syntactic description. Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a cognitive semantics*. *Typology and process in concept structuring*, vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, Sandra. 2002. 'Objects complements' and conversation towards a realistic account. *Studies in Language* 26(1): 125-164.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65(1): 31-55.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Heine, Bernd (eds.). 1991a. *Approaches to grammaticalization*, vol. 1. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Heine, Bernd (eds.). 1991b. *Types of grammatical markers*, vol. 2. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Traugott, Elizabeth & Trousdale, Graeme. 2013. *Constructionalization and constructional changes*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Van de Velde, Freek & Norde, Muriel. 2016. Exaptation. Taking stock of a controversial notion in linguistics. In Norde, Muriel & van de Velde, Freek (eds.). *Exaptation and language change*, 1-36. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Von Mengden, Ferdinand & Simon, Horst (eds.). 2014. *Refining grammaticalization*. Special issue of *Folia Linguistica* 48(2).

Willis, David. 2007. Syntactic lexicalization as a new type of degrammaticalization. *Linguistics* 45: 271-310.