

Meshing grammaticalization with construction grammar
The synchronic layering of English size noun patterns as collocationally constrained constructions

Lieselotte Brems (KULeuven)

My presentation wants to mesh basic tenets from construction grammar (CxG) and collocation studies (Sinclair 1991, Stubbs 1995) with grammaticalization research in order to describe the synchronic variation in binominal size noun uses, as attested in corpus data. With *size nouns* (SNs), I refer to nominal expressions which, in addition to their lexical meaning, express or imply (large and small) size, e.g. *bunch(es)/heap(s)/pile(s)/load(s) of* and *bit/scrap/jot of*. Random samples from the COBUILD corpus show that these patterns display polysemy that revolves around head versus modifier uses (cf. Brems 2007):

- (1) *All stop a moment when Linda, in clothes of mourning, bearing a little bunch of roses, comes through the draped doorway into the kitchen.*
- (2) *There's now a whole bunch of studies from different cities that show the same things.*
- (3) *I've met quite a few lotto winners over the years, and most of them are a right bunch of misery guts.*
- (4) *A sixteenth century scrap of parchment, yellow with age, bears the signature of Guillaume Debande.*
- (5) *Yet, according to John Studd, "There is not a scrap of evidence that progesterone therapy for PMS works.*
- (6) *When he is away from Billingshurst he feels not the remotest jot of nostalgia for the place.*

I will argue that describing this polysemy requires looking at these patterns as constructions that are collocationally constrained, pre- or postnominally. Such patterns are then a variant of Goldberg's (2006) 'partially filled constructions', in which parts of the construction are not variable, but filled in by systematic collocational patterns between the nodal SN and (adjectival, determiner etc.) elements premodifying them, or between the SN and the elements following *of*. I will also argue that the synchronic variation of SN-uses is the result of diachronic processes of grammaticalization and (inter-)subjectification, viewed in a construction-based approach (cf. Traugott 2006). The present polysemy, then, is the result of head to modifier reanalyses and extension or restructuring of collocational range/patterns of SNs, leading to synchronic 'layering' (Hopper 1991), as in examples (1)-(6).

Integrating grammaticalization research with CxG may remedy imprecisions in the terminological apparatus of the grammaticalization paradigm, which has recently come in for criticism (Campbell 2001 and Joseph 2001). The reanalysis of SN-expressions such as *loads of* and *jot of* as new quantifiers for instance suggests a closer integration of 'reanalysis' and 'analogy' than usually assumed (see Hopper and Traugott 2003, compare Fischer 2007). Reanalysis in grammaticalization can then be operationalized as the functional and formal approximation of a source construction to a target construction, the characteristics of which it gradually acquires (cf. 'gradient category change'; Denison 2006). In the context of SN-expressions, I argue that this furthermore involves different levels of schematicity, viz. the macro, meso and micro-level (cf. Traugott 2006). SN-expressions such as *loads of* and *jot of*, as new quantifiers, model themselves more distantly on semantically more schematic macro-quantifiers such as *many/much*, *little/few*, and closer to home on more specific (periphrastic) meso-quantifiers such as *lot of* and *bit of*. In addition, SN-expressions as quantifiers retain

properties specific to them on the micro-level, for instance differences in collocational range or semantic prosody. The latter refers to the systematic association between a node and sets of either negative or positive collocates (Bublitz 1996), e.g. *bunch of crap/nonsense* versus *heaps of fun/atmosphere*.

- Brems, Lieselotte. 2007. *The synchronic layering of size noun and type noun constructions in English*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Leuven.
- Bublitz, Wolfram. 1996. "Semantic prosody and cohesive company: 'somewhat predictable'". *Leuvense Bijdragen* 85: 1-32.
- Campbell, Lyle. 2001. "What's wrong with grammaticalization?". *Language Sciences* 23: 113-161.
- Fischer, Olga. 2007. *Morphosyntactic Change: Functional and Formal Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldberg, Adele. 2006. *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. New York : Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd Edition. London: Arnold.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1991. "On some principles of grammaticization". In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, eds. *Approaches to Grammaticalization, Vol. I*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 17-36.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph, Brian D. 2001. "Is there such a thing as 'grammaticalization'?". *Language Sciences* 23 : 163-186.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume 2: Descriptive Application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. forthcoming. "A constructional approach to Grammaticalization".
- McGregor, William B. *Semiotic Grammar*. Oxford : Clarendon.
- Sinclair, John. 1991. *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stubbs, Michael. 1995. "Collocations and semantic profiles: On the cause of the trouble with quantitative studies". *Functions of Language* (2) 1: 23-55.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2006. "Constructions and language change revisited: the concepts of constructional emergence and coercion from the perspective of grammaticalization". Paper presented at CGN 3, Düsseldorf, 1-2 April 2006.