REVIEW OF VAN GOETHEM, NORDE, COUSSÉ & VANDERBAUWHEDE (2018), *CATEGORY CHANGE FROM A CONSTRUCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE*

EVA ZEHENTNER
University of York/University of Zurich

1 INTRODUCTION

Over the last decade, Diachronic Construction Grammar has been used more and more often to model not only specific changes in the histories of diverse languages, but also broader phenomena or pathways of language change (cf. e.g. Bergs & Diewald 2008, Patten 2012, De Smet 2013, Hilpert 2013, 2014, Traugott & Trousdale 2013, Barðdal, Smirnova, Sommerer & Gildea 2015, Sommerer 2018, among others). Van Goethem et al.'s (2018) volume *Category Change from a Constructional Perspective* presents a welcome addition to this growing body of literature. The volume zooms in on the intersection between the more 'traditional' constructionist focus on larger syntactic constructions, and construction morphology, which has only recently started to receive more attention (cf. e.g. the relevant contributions in Boogaart, Colleman & Rutten 2014). The book consists of an impressive number of eleven chapters, of which nine constitute research articles, framed by an introduction by the editors in the beginning, and a discussion chapter by Graeme TROUSDALE in the back. The research papers are divided into three main groups: while HIEBER, as well as NORDE & MORRIS, are concerned with the emergence of new constructions, most papers deal with change in existing constructions, either syntactic patterns (COUSSÉ, DENISON, FONTEYN & HEYVAERT, as well as VAN GOETHEM, VANDERBAUWHEDE & DE SMET) or morphological constructions (BOOIJ & AUDRING, BATTEFELD, LEUSCHNER & RAWOENS, and KOUTSOUKOS).

The individual contributions are summarised in the following.

2 Summary

2.1 Part I: Introduction

Chapter 1, which at the same time forms Part I of the volume, is titled 'Category change from a constructional perspective: Introduction'. This introductory overview by the editors is the shortest of all the contributions at only six pages, possibly motivated by the large number of papers and the corresponding size of the volume. The chapter divides into three sections: the authors start off with two sections reporting on previous research and background information on key questions in category change, followed by a third section on the aims and scope of the present volume. The first, somewhat misleadingly (or at least too restrictively) headed section 'Linguistic categories: Discrete or gradient?' reviews definitions of the concept of 'category' and ways of delimiting categories. Here, Van Goethem et al. conclude that "[f]rom a diachronic perspective [...] it makes more sense to adopt the view of gradient categories" (p4) – if we allow for 'fuzzy' boundaries, with items able to have features of different categories, shifts from one category to another can be plausibly explained. Category change per se is discussed in the second section. Most importantly, the editors here briefly comment on context-independent versus context-sensitive category change (which they view as a continuum rather than a binary distinction) and contextualise the issue in terms of research on grammaticalisation and lexicalisation. The final part of the chapter sees a list of the six main research questions addressed in the volume, such as the role of constructionalisation in category change; these questions are briefly related to the different contributions. As the editors state, together these "provide convincing evidence of the benefits of a constructional approach to categories and category change" (p8).

2.2 Part II: Category genesis

In 'Category genesis in Chitimacha: A constructional approach', Daniel W. HIEBER addresses the intriguing question of what part analogy plays in the emergence of new constructions *ex nihilo*. As he rightly observes, categories typically form when linguistic elements align by analogy to one or more existent words, i.e. one or a small set of analogical attractors. However, this is not the only possible scenario: categories may arise without such pre-existing forms serving as the basis of analogical extension. That is, through a process Hieber terms 'schematization', abstractions over a range of forms that are

perceived as similar may result in the creation of an entirely new class. The author illustrates this using the case study of preverbs in Chitimacha, an isolate spoken in Louisiana between the early 18th and the early 20th century. This language featured nine monosyllabic pre-verbal elements, adding specific directional and aspectual semantic information to the meaning of the full verb. Hieber scrutinises the attested meanings of these preverbs in the available material, aiming to reconstruct their diachronic development, and concludes that "each proto-preverb independently underwent a series of micro-changes (constructional changes) that happened to converge on a shared set of properties" (p35). Recognising such similarities, most importantly directional meaning and a preference for pre-verbal position, speakers could have generalised over the various different forms, eventually leading to the emergence of a new schema, the category of 'preverb'. Once established, the members of the new abstract class underwent additional (formal) changes to align even further to each other (and diverge from other, non-member forms). These later developments are reminiscent of and potentially interesting to analyse in terms of the 'attraction' processes outlined in De Smet, D'hoedt, Fonteyn & Van Goethem (2018). Hieber's analysis furthermore neatly fits Traugott and Trousdale's (2013) distinction between pre-constructionalisation constructional changes, constructionalisation proper, and post-constructionalisation changes: the early, minor changes in the individual constructions lay the ground for the emergence of a new node, followed by more small changes at a later point. Finally, Hieber's argument is in line with other investigations into abstractions over heterogeneous input (cf. e.g. De Smet, Ghesquière & Van de Velde 2015 on multiple source constructions) and adds to recent discussions about horizontal links between constructions at the same level of schematicity. Such links can lead to higher-level, vertically linked generalisations (cf. e.g. Perek 2015 on the ditransitive 'constructeme'). Although the empirical basis of the study is limited by the amount of available data, leaving it unclear how representative or reliable his results can be, and even though constructional reconstruction may be criticised on various grounds, this paper thus presents a compelling and well-argued case which touches on a range of highly relevant issues in current diachronic construction grammar accounts.

The question of horizontal (or 'lateral') links in addition to vertical ('inheritance') links is also taken up in the following chapter on 'Derivation without category change: A network-based analysis of diminutive prefixoids in Dutch' (Chapter 3). In this paper, Muriel Norde and Caroline Morris focus on a specific sub-type of Dutch prefixoids which are formally diminutives, but have the pragmatic function of emphasis or downtoning, e.g.

bloedjeserieus 'very serious' (blood-ᴅɪᴍ-serious). Moreover, despite sharing many morphosyntactic properties, the diminutive morpheme in prefixoid constructions differs from regular diminutives in not changing the category of its head. As to their origins, the authors argue that diminutive prefixoid constructions (DPCs) do not derive diachronically from the corresponding free diminutive forms, but rather constitute "diminutive variants of existing prefixoid constructions" (p49). The paper reports on the results of a corpus study on DPCs on Google presented in Morris (2013). In addition to type and (to some extent) token frequency, the investigated variables include the sociolinguistic features of gender, age, and region, formal properties such as morphophonology (precisely allomorphy of the diminutive suffix) and part of speech of the head of the diminutive element, as well as the semantics of the entire pattern. Approaching the findings from a network perspective, the authors propose a complex system of hierarchical and intra-paradigmatic relations, in which individual DPCs inherit both from a more abstract prefixoid schema and a diminutive schema. However, inheritance is only partial in the case of the latter, suggesting that in multiple inheritance relations, not all features of the different inputs are necessarily present in the lower-level construction. Norde & Morris furthermore argue that the higher-level schemas are not fully productive (yet), and posit that the lateral links between diminutive and non-diminutive micro-constructions were at least initially more salient than their vertical relations, or indeed preceded them. Finally, the possibility of other sources for new DPCs, such as debonding of prefixoids, is briefly discussed: this indicates that the predominance of one particular type of input does not preclude other sources resulting in the same output, or other sources aligning with the dominant pattern.

This paper by Norde & Morris is a rather tough read, not least because the methodology is not entirely clear, and the discussion is somewhat detached from the findings. (For example, while investigating the sociolinguistic dimension of the issue is certainly valid, the results do not seem to be taken up in the discussion, or do not appear to be relevant to the narrative.) While the phenomenon clearly lends itself to a constructional, network-based analysis, the authors also make little effort to foreground the question to what extent the changes observed in fact constitute 'category changes' – a discussion which would seem to be quite relevant in a volume on precisely this topic.

2.3   Part III: Category change in syntactic constructions

In Chapter 5 'Grammaticalization, host-class expansion and category change', Evie Coussé shifts the focus to a different type of category change, namely

host-class expansion in grammaticalisation as a category-internal change. Rather than examining elements changing category membership, she presents two case studies of entire categories undergoing changes in their internal structure. More specifically, this paper is concerned with the increasing loss of restrictions on the elements able to fill an open slot in a grammaticalising pattern, and links this issue to prototype theory. First, the author revisits Coussé's (2014) findings on the *have* and *be* perfect in Dutch, and the gradual expansion of past participles these auxiliaries collocated with. The second case study is on two Spanish binominal quantifier constructions – consisting of the quantifier *aluvión de* 'a flood of' or *montón de* 'a heap of' and an open slot for an expanding set of nouns – based on data from Verveck-ken (2015). Coussé finds that with all patterns, the open slot-fillers show a graded internal structure according to prototypes; although the prototypical semantic core of the individual constructions differs in terms of generality or specificity, it can be traced to the patterns' origins (i.e. the semantics and possible collocational restrictions of the source patterns) in all cases. Host-class expansion is then "shown to proceed away from the prototypical core" (p111), since new additions to the open slot "share fewer features with the core than the original members in the schematic category and will as a result be situated in the periphery of the category" (p99). A final character-istic not shared by all investigated patterns is 'semantic clustering': while the collocates of the *have* perfect can be grouped into two clusters around particularly frequent verbs (verbs of buying and selling, respectively), the situation is less straightforward with the other constructions. Nevertheless, it can be observed that if there is clustering, it does not necessarily take place around specific lexical items, but rather conceptual frames. While it may have been interesting to more clearly relate grammaticalisation to the con-struction grammar concept of (grammatical) constructionalisation, this paper provides relevant insights into the role of prototypes and prototypicality in constructional change as well as the definition of 'categories' in such a framework. The article furthermore elegantly illustrates that change typically starts in highly restricted contexts, followed by an increasing "weakening of these collocational bonds" (Trousdale, p294). This issue is taken up in various other contributions as well, which benefits the volume in terms of coherence.

As the second contribution of Part III on category change in syntactic constructions (Chapter 5), David DENISON tackles the development of *long*, in a paper titled 'Why would anyone *take long*? Word classes and Construction Grammar in the history of *long*'. He returns to the question of 'fuzzy' categories or multiple category membership of lexical items, as *long* shows

underspecification between adjective and adverb in uses such as *I won't be long* or *all night long*. Employing both a quantitative and qualitative approach to the phenomenon, Denison investigates the word in two historical English corpora – the YCOE for Old English, and the PPCME2 for Middle English, supplemented by data from additional corpora for later periods – as well as the recorded definitions in the MED and OED. Filtering out clearly adjectival and clearly adverbial uses of *long*, he then pinpoints ambiguous (or, more specifically, 'vague') instances and demonstrates that these are not recent innovations. Rather, the element exhibits signs of underspecification or decategorialisation already in the earliest attestations, often being used in a semi-grammatical function. Still, a certain degree of underdetermination (or underspecification) has enabled step-wise shifts in the properties of the word, eventually leading to the specific patterns found in Present Day English. That is, the history of *long* evidences a number of micro-expansions at different stages, culminating in the PDE situation. Each of these steps involves a neoanalysis of specific sequences, facilitated by analogical thinking.

Denison here makes a forceful case for the possibility of category vagueness or mixed category status, arguing that underdetermination is typically resolved elsewhere – for example, "the morphosyntactic peculiarities of *long* [are] more easily handled at the phrasal than the word level" (p140). On a more general level, Denison questions both the psychological reality of discrete categories in speaker minds, and the need for discrete categorisation on the part of the linguist. As Trousdale sums up, "while certain distributional properties might encourage us to assign a particular item into a particular category, there are some occasions where such a categorization is either impossible, unnecessary, or both" (p297). Although the paper touches on a variety of issues also treated in other contributions to the volume, it is at times difficult to grasp its main argument due to a rather muddled structure and presentation of methodology. The excursus on comparable patterns in recent Danish, although curious, seems to add little insights to the discussion: the author himself states that "[i]t is unclear to me how valid it is to use Danish data from the late twentieth century and early twenty-first to corroborate earlier English developments" (p145).

Chapter 6 by Lauren FONTEYN and Liesbet HEYVAERT is on 'Category change in the English gerund: Tangled web or fine-tuned constructional network?'. In this dense, but well-argued and highly stimulating paper, the authors address the development of the gerund in Middle English, specifically the change from nominal to verbal gerunds. They present a functional analysis of the phenomenon which is grounded in Langacker's view of both noun phrases and finite clauses as 'deictic expressions', and

give particular attention to 'bare', i.e. determinerless, nominal gerunds such as *in reading of it*. The empirical starting point of their analysis is a qualitative and quantitative investigation of all bare nominal and all verbal gerunds in texts written produced between 1250 and 1500. The main conclusions the authors draw are first, that "within the context of bare gerunds [...] the formal verbalization of the gerund was tightly linked to a shift in referential or deictic behaviour" (p152). They find that in certain bridging contexts – to which they add two contexts not identified in previous research – determinerless gerunds could shift towards a referential behaviour that is more clause-like, corresponding to (or indeed furthering) their increasingly more clausal formal features. Secondly, Fonteyn & Heyvaert argue that the observed changes can be analysed as the formation of a new constructional node for the verbal gerund. Nevertheless, the new construction is still strongly connected to the nominal gerund and vertically links to an overarching NP schema: "while the English gerund is a heterogeneous category consisting of two (especially formally) distinguishable higher-order constructions and several lower-level constructional schemata with varying degrees of overlap [...], the language user still seems able to generalize over nominal and verbal gerunds based on their similarities" (p173). This development thus illustrates an internal category split, where a distinction in discourse function leads to the emergence of a distinct subtype of verbal gerunds and the formation of distinct functional niches from an initially truly hybrid construction. It furthermore provides a great example of category strengthening, defined by Trousdale as "one product of constructionalization [which] may involve the sharpening of the alignment between form and function, and an increase in the distinctiveness of various micro-constructions within a particular schema, where particular patterns of language use serve to entrench the symbolic relation between a particular formal organization and a set of functions, both in terms of discourse and semantics" (p304). Importantly, this sharpening of distinctions is not necessarily due to changes in the new construction only, but also involves changes in the source pattern. This paper thereby shows not only what insights can be gained by careful and diligent historical data analysis, but also presents a great showcase for the benefits that taking a constructional, network-based approach to category change can have.

In Chapter 7, Kristel Van Goethem, Gudrun Vanderbauwhede and Hendrik De Smet address 'The emergence of a new adverbial downtoner: Constructional change and constructionalisation of Dutch [*ver van* X] and [*verre van* X] 'far from X' '. This paper very clearly and straightforwardly assesses the synchronic distribution and diachronic development of the two (related) Dutch counterparts of the English [*far from* X] downtoner construction. In

a first step, based on a random sample of both variants taken from a large webcorpus of Present Day Dutch (NLCOW2012-00X), they show that while [*ver van* X] is consistently associated with spatial or metaphorical semantics, [*verre van* X] is most typically used in downtoner function. The patterns moreover clearly differ with regard to their complementation patterns: the former shows a very strong preference for N(P) or pronominal complements, whereas the latter is mainly found with adjectives. The authors' results on the history of the patterns suggest that this clear-cut distinction is a relatively recent phenomenon – the forms significantly overlapped in their functions until the mid-19th century, but have come to gradually diverge from each other since, with the predictive power of semantics and complementation types increasing over time. The precise diachronic scenario Van Goethem, Vanderbauwhede & De Smet propose is as follows: in the first stage, the two variants are only formally distinguished, but both express the same, spatial or metaphorical, meaning. Rather than constituting two separate constructions, they are part of one single, formally slightly underspecified construction. Once the construction develops a new downtoning function – facilitated in cases where the expression combines with an infinitival complement – there is form-function friction, eventually leading to a constructional split. While [*ver van* X] 'sheds' the innovative meaning again, and resorts to the constructions' original preferences for nominal complements and spatial meaning, [*verre van* X] specialises to a downtoning function. The authors conclude that "[s]ince a new form-meaning pair emerges by the end of the process, [...] the use of *verre van* as adverbial downtoner is the result of true constructionalisation" (p200). By contrast, [*ver van* X] has only been affected by 'minor constructional changes', without the creation of a new node.

This contribution ties in perfectly with the preceding paper by Fonteyn & Heyvaert in pinpointing small changes which may result in mismatches between form and function, as a consequence of which a new constructional node can emerge. At the same time, the authors demonstrate that while constructionalisation may often be the outcome of such a situation, category change is not necessarily always constructionalisation. Like Fonteyn & Heyvaert, the paper furthermore presents a clear case of constructional niche creation of both patterns; the constructions diverge from each other in a process of category strengthening rather than only the newly constructionalised structure differentiating from its source. These divergences may concern functional properties, but can also involve formal features such as collocational profiles.

2.4   Part IV: Category change in morphological constructions

Chapter 8 on 'Category change in construction morphology' by Geert Booij and Jenny Audring marks the beginning of Part IV of the volume, shifting attention from syntactic to morphological constructions and to highly context-dependent category changes. Their paper considers instances of coercion-by-override, meaning that a lexical word may be 'coerced' into a constructional slot despite being of a different category than the elements typically filling the slot. In such cases, the semantics of the abstract pattern 'override' the semantics of the word, and may ultimately cause it to lose all features associated with the source category, completely changing word class. Such changes may take place by means of conversion, or through the addition of overt morphological marking. For example, in the English sentence *I would try to out-absurd him*, the prefix coerces the adjective *absurd* into an action reading (i.e. a verbal reading); if used in the past tense, the default option would be to add the regular past tense suffix, yielding *out-absurded*. However, such instances of coercion are typically characterised by strong constraints. For example, only a highly restricted set of prepositions, or rather preposition combinations license the coercion of certain Dutch adjectives into the nominal complement slot of PPs.

The main phenomena the authors draw on in this paper are three different Dutch constructions, (i) the *op het* ADJ-*e af* 'almost ADJ' construction, (ii) the *aan de* [V]$_N$ '(having the habit of) V' construction, and (iii) the [*voor de* N]$_{PP}$ 'for the N (of it)' pattern. As is shown, in all of these cases there is some flexibility concerning the elements appearing in the open slot, even though the productivity of the schemas varies. Finally, the authors comment on the possibility of certain morphological constructions being more productive when used in the context of specific larger syntactic constructions, a phenomenon they term 'embedded productivity'.

This paper raises interesting points, but lacks a clearer and more explicit discussion of the processes at play here: for instance, it is not defined what it really means that coercion takes place only "if the construction used has the power of override" (p226). Similarly, little explicit connection is made to other contributions in the volume which focus on host-class expansion of constructions, although the changes in question similarly illustrate "the idea of specific local contexts in the early stages of change, and context expansion in later stages" (Trousdale, p294).

The chapter is followed by a contribution on 'Evaluative morphology in German, Dutch and Swedish: Constructional networks and the loci of change' by Malte Battefeld, Torsten Leuschner and Gudrun Rawoens (Chapter 9). This data-rich paper investigates category change with prefixoids, loan

prefixes and bare nouns in German, Dutch and Swedish, all of which have undergone (or are currently undergoing) a shift to evaluative adjective use. For instance, German *Hammer* (originally 'hammer') has developed from prefixoid use in informal patterns like *Hammerwetter* 'great weather' into a (defective) ameliorative adjective, likely through re-categorisation in predicative position (*das Wetter ist hammer* 'the weather is great'). Using web corpora of the different languages, the authors extract tokens of relevant types, and qualitatively investigate a range of distributional and semantic features of the elements in question – including e.g. evidence from spelling, or the absence/presence of inflectional morphology. They argue that the scenario outlined for 'hammer' is a common pathway for such evaluative morphemes. More specifically, non-head position in nominal or adjectival compounds, as well as predicative uses, are seen as the main loci of change. This debonding, i.e. use as a free evaluative, is further facilitated by the existence of adjectival intensifying compounds in some cases (e.g. *hammerdumm* 'very stupid'). The relations between the different uses of the items are then mapped in an intricate and complex network of evaluative expressions; the emergence of adjectival evaluatives in this network is analysed as a clear case of gradual constructionalisation. As the authors themselves state, the contribution fits well with the preceding paper by Booij & Audring in showing that with evaluatives, among other cases, "word-formation and syntax are intertwined in intricate ways" (p258). It also overlaps with Denison in highlighting that category status of lexical items may be indeterminate, and provides another look at the status of affixoids as a potentially distinct category (cf. Norde & Morris).

The article presents a detailed and meticulous account of an as yet understudied phenomenon of informal language use in Germanic languages, focussing on the commonalities between the various items and languages, and providing a broader constructional, network-based perspective on the phenomenon. Its only downside is at the same time one of its merits: consolidating the number of different issues covered in the study requires considerable space, making the paper quite heavy.

The last research paper of the volume is by Nikos Koutsoukos, who discusses 'Constructional change on the contentful-procedural gradient: The case of the *-idz(o)* construction in Griko'. Koutsoukos here tackles the little-known Greek-based dialect of Griko, spoken in South Italy, zooming in on instances of transition from derivation to inflection, through what he calls "a gradient and gradual recategorization process" (p265). His main claim is that "some derivational constructions may change by acquiring a more functional status which is characteristic of inflectional categories and this type

of change moves along the *contentful-procedural gradient*" (p265). The case study presented in the paper is the Griko 'verbaliser' *-idz(o)*, part of a category of derivational suffixes with the function of forming verbs from other word classes. This suffix is shown to be currently undergoing change towards more inflectional characteristics. Specifically, a number of newer *-idz(o)*-formations are based on verbs, in which case the suffix does not induce any category change; the derived forms furthermore do not differ from the underived bases in their semantics or complementation patterns. The reasons for such a development with this particular suffix only are sought in its phonological features, which invite reanalysis as a stem allomorph in particular tenses. Importantly, Koutsoukos argues that the suffix is still straightforwardly derivational when combined with nominal bases but has moved towards more inflectional behaviour when used with verbs. He thus posits a split between different uses of the morpheme, one of which is more grammatical or 'procedural' than the other (incidentally illustrating that the principle of 'no synonymy' seems to apply not only in syntax, but also in morphology). Both types are then interpreted as 'constructional idioms' linked to a more abstract *-idz(o)*-schema in which the basis is unspecified. The paper presents a solid and fruitful discussion of borderline phenomena between derivation and inflection (cf. also e.g. English adverbial *-ly*), although it remains uncertain to what extent the changes in question constitute 'category change' in the strictest sense. The network model proposed would furthermore benefit from incorporating recent ideas about relations in the constructicon. More specifically, the concept of horizontal links is only touched on in a footnote, but would clearly prove useful in this case.

2.5 Part V: Discussion

Last, Chapter 11 (and simultaneously Part V) of the volume sees Graeme Trousdale consolidating and synthesising the preceding papers, in a contribution titled 'Change in category membership from the perspective of construction grammar: A commentary'. Trousdale identifies three main issues that feature prominently in the volume: first, and most basically, the contributions are concerned with either category emergence or the restructuring of existent categories, while category loss is not dealt with in any of the papers. Second, Trousdale notes that the changes scrutinised in the volume are typically gradual and cumulative rather than abrupt. Finally, as also evident from the summaries just presented, category changes lend themselves to analysis in terms of constructional networks. Changes in individual constructions may (but do not have to) lead to constructional splits and the emergence ('constructionalisation') of new patterns. Importantly,

these newly constructionalised variants do not stand on their own, but remain linked to their source construction; in general, all constructions may be influenced by connected patterns in the network. The focus of (diachronic) construction grammar accounts such as those included in this volume is then on untangling these complex interactions and determining the direction of impact as well as the precise relations between the patterns in question. Trousdale discusses each of the three main areas with reference to the papers in the volume, and manages to provide a comprehensive but also thought-provoking wrap-up to the large number of quite diverse contributions. He closes the chapter with a list of issues to be explored further in future research, based on questions dealt with at various places in the volume. This includes the the role of horizontal links between constructions at the same level of schematicity, which has recently become the focus of much attention (e.g. Van de Velde 2014, Diessel 2015, Traugott 2018, Zehentner & Traugott forthcoming). Similarly, the idea of multiple source constructions in language change has been shown to be relevant and applicable in many instances of category change (cf. e.g. De Smet et al. 2015, and the contributions therein). Most generally, as listed as a final suggestion by Trousdale, the volume nicely demonstrates a continuing need to examine the similarities and differences between change in morphological versus syntactic constructions.

3 Evaluation

3.1 *Contents and coverage: Open questions in Construction Grammar*

This volume has substantial merits in addressing the far-reaching and essential question of category change in a framework which has been gaining in popularity in both synchronic and diachronic linguistics in recent decades. Many of the contributions greatly illustrate the potential benefits of taking a constructionist approach to this broader issue, and thereby provide new insights into matters that have been of interest to the linguistic community for a long time. However, the papers go beyond merely exemplifying the approach on the basis of specific case studies, touching on a range of points still very much under discussion in current construction grammar accounts. That is, they reflect the fact that construction grammar is a comparatively young framework and take up and further develop a number of open questions (cf. also Hilpert 2018 and Sommerer & Smirnova forthcoming).

First, as already mentioned, the idea that linguistic knowledge is organised in structured networks of constructions features heavily in many of the contributions, aiming to detail the precise make-up of the network of constructions they are concerned with (e.g. Norde & Morris, Fonteyn

& Heyvaert, or Battefeld, Leuschner & Rawoens). As Trousdale also notes, several papers draw on the distinction between vertical ('inheritance' or taxonomic) links and horizontal (or 'lateral') relations. While the former connect constructions at different levels of abstractness, the latter hold between patterns at the same level of schematicity (cf. also the discussion in Van de Velde 2014, Diessel 2015, and Traugott 2018). Horizontal links may be based on formal overlap, i.e. connect constructions with the same form but distinct – albeit related – meanings, or relate different structures overlapping in meaning. The diachronic implications of assuming horizontal relations in addition to vertical ones are evidenced throughout the volume – contributions such as Hieber, among others, illustrate the emergence of horizontal connections, which may lead to the formation of abstractions over a set of previously unrelated patterns (and the corresponding vertical links). Furthermore, the establishment of lateral links (as well as more abstract generalisations) may have repercussions for the precise properties of the constructions involved. Discussing the relevance of horizontal links for diachronic constructional accounts, and the potential gains of including them into network models of specific changes, the volume thus taps into some of the main unresolved issues in diachronic construction grammar as identified in Sommerer & Smirnova (forthcoming). Related to this, many contributions exemplify the concept of multiple source constructions. New schemas may be based on considerably heterogeneous input, as long as speakers perceive the source patterns as similar enough to relate them: this can be modelled as the establishment of horizontal links between these various sources.

An interesting point in this regard is the question of primacy of horizontal links versus vertical links. This is briefly addressed in Norde & Morris, when they state that "for diminutive prefixoid micro-constructions, lateral links are more important than inheritance links" (p70), but not explicitly explored in other contributions. While the volume seems to generally follow the principle of usage-basedness (not shared by all versions of construction grammar), it remains open what this entails for different types of links in the network and their status – this has received comparatively little attention in construction grammar literature to day (see Zehentner & Traugott forthcoming for a comment). Arguably, taking an essentially bottom-up approach to the emergence of abstract structures would give primary status to horizontal links: once lower-level, highly substantive patterns become laterally linked, speakers may abstract over them, leading to a new schematic node in the network, and the corresponding vertical links between the schema and the micro-construction. Although this assumption does not preclude the possibility of partial and multiple inheritance, the precise mechanisms and

implications still need to be worked out.

As also pointed out, several contributions involve discussions of constructionalisation (i.e. the emergence of new constructions), mainly following the definition put forward in Traugott & Trousdale (2013). In this seminal work, the authors distinguish between constructionalisation on the one hand, and constructional change on the other hand, with the latter only affecting parts of the original construction. Constructional changes may lay the ground for constructionalisation processes – labelled pre-constructionalisation changes – or apply to the newly emerged pattern (post-constructionalisation changes). This strict distinction has since come under quite strong criticism both from a theoretical and an empirical perspective (cf. especially Börjars, Vincent & Walkden 2015: 371–374). For example, as Sommerer & Smirnova (forthcoming) point out, "the question has been raised whether it is at all possible to draw a line between constructionalization and constructional changes, since changes observable in the data are always gradual". Even though the usefulness of the distinction is not openly deliberated in any contribution to this volume, papers such as Fonteyn & Heyvaert, as well as Van Goethem, Vanderbauwhede & De Smet, implicitly tackle the more methodological issue by providing detailed accounts of the processes involved in the changes in question.

On a more general level, the volume further expands on construction morphology besides (or in combination with) constructionist approaches to syntax. It thus supplements and expands on earlier works aiming to widen the scope of the framework such as Boogaart et al. (2014). As they state, "[u]ntil very recently, in-depth constructionist analyses of morphological phenomena were in fact scarce" (Boogaart et al. 2014: 4). Although the situation has certainly improved since the publication of their volume, most attention in the constructionist literature is nevertheless still on syntactic patterns. Joining this focus with the topic of category change as an issue traditionally more closely connected to morphology certainly proves to be a particularly interesting and fruitful endeavour.

3.2 Coherence and organisation

The volume overall presents a well-structured work: the broad distinction between Parts III and IV on category change in syntactic constructions versus morphological constructions seems well-warranted and valuable. By contrast, the decision to single out Hieber as well as Norde & Morris is less convincing – with several other contributions also dealing with the emergence of new categories (or constructionalisation in the broadest sense), the motivation for this separation is not entirely clear. Still, the selection of contributions and

ordering is generally straightforward and uncomplicated.

The volume is also coherent in that the authors seem to employ an essentially similar version of construction grammar and do not diverge dramatically in terms of terminology or definitions of key concepts. Although not necessarily shown in the contributions themselves, since there is relatively little cross-reference between the individual papers (with some exception, e.g. Battefeld, Leuschner & Rawoens), there are furthermore a number of common threads relating them. The main credit for connecting the different ideas running through the paper and aiding the reader in identifying the commonalities goes to the excellent review by Trousdale: his synthesis chapter both wraps up the volume in a comprehensive way and at the same time links the volume to the larger body of constructionist literature. Without Trousdale's contribution, readers not familiar with construction grammar may struggle to identify some of these broader issues, and thus miss out on valuable insights. This chapter thereby also – at least to some extent – remedies the shortcomings of the introduction, which, unfortunately and somewhat unexpectedly, is not very informative or effective. This is especially noticeable when compared with other introductory chapters in recent edited volumes on diachronic construction grammar such as Barðdal & Gildea (2015), which provides a great overview of the main tenets and issues covered in the book.

If there is a weak link in the present volume, it is therefore certainly the introductory chapter, failing to provide the reader with a clear and explicit outline of the volume's contents. The speculative reasoning behind keeping the introduction very general and short may have been the overall length of the volume, as well as the inclusion of the final discussion chapter. While this is understandable from a practical viewpoint, for readers considering the volume in its entirety rather than choosing to read individual parts only, it is nevertheless problematic. More specifically, there is little substantial discussion of the main issues covered in the volume and its central aims, which is unfortunate for the reader. Other than a very brief overview of the history of research into category change, the chapter does not provide much insight into the broad topic. What is also strikingly missing in my view is a more straightforward introduction to what the editors take to constitute 'a constructional perspective', in addition to reporting on the main questions in literature on category change. It is of course true that the growing popularity of Construction Grammar makes a more extensive overview of the principles of this framework less immediately necessary, and the editors may not have wanted to impose one version of Construction Grammar on the entire volume. Still, some more explicit exploration of what

taking such an approach means in the context of this volume may have been helpful.

A further, although minor (and likely unavoidable), point of criticism is the heterogeneity of the papers in terms of methodology and scope: the contributions diverge considerably from each other in their methodological approach but also rigour. While all articles are data-based, the extent and nature of the data differs quite considerably – some papers present new, quantitative data, and derive their main argument from the empirical study (e.g. Fonteyn & Heyvaert), while others take a more qualitative approach (e.g. Denison or Booij & Audring) or draw on previous case studies to illustrate or test their claims (e.g. Coussé). This is not problematic as such, but the quality and quantity of empirical work in some contributions is clearly superior to others – or is at least presented in a more convincing way. This introduces a certain imbalance into the volume, and weakens its overall impact. Finally, the volume is in line with many other works in showing a bias towards Indo-European (and more particularly, Germanic) languages. That is, although the volume covers a range of languages, the large majority of papers is based on data from Germanic languages or other Indo-European languages (such as Spanish in Coussé, and Griko in Koutsoukos). Even if this is a common issue in the field, efforts to counteract such tendencies should be encouraged; Hieber's study on Chitimacha is a welcome step towards widening the scope of construction grammar in this regard.

References

Barðdal, Jóhanna & Spike Gildea. 2015. Diachronic Construction Grammar: Epistemological context, basic assumptions and historical implications. In Barðdal et al. (2015) 1–50.

Barðdal, Jóhanna, Elena Smirnova, Lotte Sommerer & Spike Gildea (eds.). 2015. *Diachronic Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bergs, Alexander & Gabriele Diewald (eds.). 2008. *Constructions and language change*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Boogaart, Ronny, Timothy Colleman & Gijsbert Rutten (eds.). 2014. *Extending the scope of Construction Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Börjars, Kersti, Nigel Vincent & George Walkden. 2015. On constructing a theory of grammatical change. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 113. 363–382.

Coussé, Evie. 2014. Lexical expansion in the *have* and *be* perfect in Dutch: A constructionist prototype account. *Diachronica* 31. 159–191.

De Smet, Hendrik. 2013. *Spreading patterns: Diffusional change in the English system of complementation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

De Smet, Hendrik, Frauke D'hoedt, Lauren Fonteyn & Kristel Van Goethem. 2018. The changing functions of competing forms: Attraction and differentiation. *Cognitive Linguistics* 29. 197–234.

De Smet, Hendrik, Lobke Ghesquière & Freek Van de Velde (eds.). 2015. *On multiple source constructions in language change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Diessel, Holger. 2015. Usage-based construction grammar. In Ewa Dąbrowska & Dagmar Divjak (eds.), *The handbook of cognitive linguistics*, 295–321. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hilpert, Martin. 2013. *Constructional change in English: Developments in allomorphy, word formation, and syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hilpert, Martin. 2014. *Construction Grammar and its application to English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Hilpert, Martin. 2018. Three open questions in Diachronic Construction Grammar. In Evie Coussé, Peter Andersson & Joel Olofsson (eds.), *Grammaticalization meets Construction Grammar*, 21–39. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Morris, Caroline. 2013. *Bekje-af, knettertjegek en dolletjesgelukkig: The use and development of intensifying diminutive compounds in Dutch within the framework of Construction Morphology*. University of Groningen MA thesis.

Patten, Amanda. 2012. *The English IT-cleft: A constructional account and a diachronic investigation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Perek, Florent. 2015. *Argument structure in usage-based construction grammar: Experimental and corpus–based perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sommerer, Lotte. 2018. *Article emergence in Old English: A constructionalist perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sommerer, Lotte & Elena Smirnova (eds.). Forthcoming. *Nodes and links in the network: Advances in Diachronic Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2018. Modeling language change with constructional networks. In Salvador Pons Bordería & Óscar Loureda Lamas (eds.), *Beyond grammaticalization and discourse markers: New issues in the study of language change*, 17–50. Leiden: Brill.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and constructional changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Goethem, Kristel, Muriel Norde, Evie Coussé & Gudrun Vanderbauwhede (eds.). 2018. *Category change from a constructional perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Van de Velde, Freek. 2014. Degeneracy: The maintenance of constructional

networks. In Boogaart et al. (2014) 141–180.

Verveckken, Katrien. 2015. Towards a constructional account of high and
low frequency binominal quantifiers in Spanish. *Cognitive Linguistics* 23.
421–478.

Zehentner, Eva & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. Forthcoming. Constructional
networks and the development of benefactive ditransitives in English. In
Sommerer & Smirnova (Forthcoming).

Eva Zehentner
Department of Language and Linguistic Science
University of York
Campus Heslington West
YO10 5DD York
United Kingdom
eva.zehentner@york.ac.uk