

There is more to morphological change ...

Hans Henrich Hock (University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign)

Grammaticalization is widely considered the most important, or only important, factor driving morphological change. Dissenting voices have focused on counter evidence to the claimed unidirectionality of grammaticalization, and adherents have questioned the force of that evidence or tried to reduce contrary developments to a minimum (for the latter, see Haspelmath 2004). The most recent argument against Grammaticalization is Joseph's (2007) "Why I don't believe in Grammaticalization".

While I accept Grammaticalization as an important factor in morphological change, especially in the development of new morphology, I argue that it is only one factor among many and that morphological change, especially in existing morphological systems, reflects a variety of other factors. One obvious, often overlooked, factor for change is borrowing. Consider English, much of whose morphology results from the integration of Latin/Greek vocabulary, the abduction that this vocabulary is morphologically complex, and the extension of that morphology to new contexts (e.g. *antidisestablishmentarianism*, every morpheme of which has entered English through borrowing).

Since the neogrammarians, analogy has been considered a factor driving morphological change, so much so that Kuryłowicz's important paper on the direction of analogical change generally speaks of "morphological change", and relegates the term "analogique" to the title. (See also the fact that standard handbooks, such as Anttila, Hock which devote much space to analogical change, but devote little space to other morphological change.)

I present evidence that morphological change can also be driven by aspects of the morphological or morphosyntactic system – "morphological pressure". However, rather than trying to find examples that can only be attributed to morphological pressure, I focus on cases where several factors interact, including morphological pressure, grammaticalization, and yet other phenomena.

The major focus is on a morphosyntactic chain shift in Hindia (and related languages). Briefly, the situation is as follows. Sanskrit, the (quasi-)ancestor had only a simple present, without distinguishing progressive from non-progressive. It did however have marginal, not fully grammaticalized constructions with present participle or perfective converb plus helping verb ('go, sit, stand', as well as 'be') to indicate habitual action. In late Middle Indo-Aryan, one of these (present participle plus 'be', became grammaticalized as (quasi-)progressive. From early Modern Indo-Aryan to the present, the old simple present evidently came to be reinterpreted as (marked) perfective and the (quasi-)progressive as (unmarked) imperfective – a marking reversal. The perfective, as in much of Slavic, came to be reinterpreted as incompatible with present time (except for 'be') and acquired modal/future functions. This left the simple present "slot" in the system empty, and the old progressive moved into that function. This, in turn, left a gap in the progressive, and a marginal construction with perfective converb plus a verb meaning 'remain' (plus 'be') moved into that position.

While some of the developments can be considered cases of grammaticalization, the factors driving the chain shift are, first, reinterpretation of perfective as non-present and hence modal/future and, more important, the morphological pressure of preserving distinctions that were endangered by other developments.

Anttila, Raimo. 1972 An introduction to historical and comparative linguistics. New York: Macmillan.

—1988 Historical and comparative linguistics. [= Revised edition of Anttila 1972.] Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Haspelmath, Martin. 2004 On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. In: *Up and down the Cline – The Nature of Grammaticalization*, edited by Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde and Harry Perridon, 17-44. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1986 *Principles of historical linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
—1991 *Principles of historical linguistics*; second, corrected and augmented edition. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Joseph, Brian D. 2007 Why I don't believe in grammaticalization. Plenary Talk, 2007 LOT Summer School, Leuven.