LUND UNIVERSITY

Modern Swedish bara – from adjective to conditional subordinator.

Rosenkvist, Henrik

2005

[Link to publication](#)

Total number of authors:
1

Modern Swedish bara – *from adjective to conditional subordinator*

Henrik Rosenkvist

1. Introduction[1]

The MSw conditional subordinator *bara* conveys two distinct sub-meanings; by using *bara* ('if only' or 'if just') instead of the default *om* ('if') the speaker underlines that what is expressed in the apodosis is desired, and that the condition in the protasis is explicitly sufficient ('no more than X is needed for Y to occur', or 'if just X, then Y'):

(1)   **Bara** det slutar regna så kan vi resa tältet.
          if only it   ceases to-rain   PL can we raise tent-the
          "**If just** the rain stops we may pitch the tent"

These semantic properties of conditional *bara* make the use of it restricted (Wijk-Andersson 1991:179) – it can not, as a rule, be used in atypical conditional clauses (like for instance speech act conditionals, cf. Sweetser 1990). In this paper the evolution of conditional *bara* is investigated, from both a semantic and a syntactic perspective, and it is argued that both the path of change as well as the origin of *bara* have contributed to the semantic peculiarities of conditional *bara*. Furthermore, I claim that it is necessary to utilize both syntactic and semantic modes of explanation in order to understand the entire development.

  In section 2, the background of *bara* is presented. The assumed development can then be found in sections 3 and 4. The topic of section 5 is a handful of other grams, the evolution of which may contribute to the understanding of the changes of *bara*: MSw *allena, allenast,*

blott, *enbart* and *endast*. The possible theoretical implications of the asssumed changes are discussed in section 6, from the perspective of grammaticalization theory.

2. The etymological origin of bara

Bara was originally, according to SAOB[2] (B 292), an inflected variant of the EOSw [3] adjective *bar*, which had the meanings 'bare, naked, uncovered'; the affix *-a* is frequent in the nominal paradigms of inflection in OSw. The root is probably Indoeuropean (Hellquist 1980:51, Pfeifer 1989:122), and it consequently appears, with approximately the same basic meaning, in a number of languages that are closely related to Swedish.[4]

SAOB (B 281-295) accounts for three lexical instances of *bara*: as an inflected form of the adjective *bar*, as an uninflectable adjective and as an adverb/subordinator. A number of various meanings are presented in SAOB; in the following section I suggest that these can be attributed to two different paths of meaning development. One of these, the meaning of 'obvious' and the related meanings, was a semantic cul-de-sac (see below).

3. From adjective to adverb

In the beginning of the 16:th century, the adjective *bar* could mean either 'naked, uncovered' (2 a) or 'obvious, manifest' (2 b):

---

[2] The lexicon of the Swedish Academy.
[3] Swedish is traditionally divided into the following chronological periods: Runic Swedish 800-1225, Early Old Swedish 1225-1375, Late Old Swedish 1375-1526, Early Modern Swedish 1526-1732, Late Modern Swedish 1732-.
[4] Another possible explanation for the adverbial *bara* might be that it has been developed from the adjective *bar* through derivation. In the old Nordic languages, a derivating suffix *-a* could be employed when adjectives were turned into adverbs (Hanssen et al 1975:86). Both *ill-a* and *gärn-a* are examples of such derivation (cf Wijk-Andersson 1991:52f). However, it seems as this kind of suffixation was rather rare, and it is very unlikely that it was in use at the time when adverbial *bara* appears (SAOB:s first examples of adverbial *bara* are from the end of the 16:th century). Therefore the aforementioned hypothesis must be preferred.

(2 a)   oc the hwggo hiälmen aff honom oc bleff sedan **baar** oc owänkter (Troja, 1529)

and they hacked helmet-the off him and became then bare and unprotected

"and they hacked off his helmet and he then became **bare** and unprotected"

(2 b)   Heluetet är **baart** för honom [...] (SAOB, 1541)

hell-the is obvious for him [...]

"Hell is **manifest** for him"

In the end of the 16:th century, an adverbial *bara* appears, with the meaning 'completely, fully', and some decades later we find examples of an adjectival *bar* with a very similar meaning. It seems likely that this meaning ('completely') emanates from the earlier meaning 'obvious, manifest' (2 b). Another meaning that probably is related to this small semantic field is a meaning related to money ('cash'), which we find as early as 1540 (SAOB:B 286). SAOB mentions the German constructions *bares geld*, *bar bezahlen* as a possible source of influence for the emergence of this meaning. In contemporary Swedish, none of these meanings are in use. The related meanings 'obvious', 'completely' and 'cash' consequently seem to have been dead ends, and they did not, I assume, take part in the rise of conditional *bara*.

In the early 17:th century, however, we find a new meaning of the adjectival   *bar*: 'only, merely, no more than' (3 a). At about the same time (the first example in SAOB is from 1620), an adverbial *bara* appears, with the same meaning (3 b):

(3 a)   [...] Gibraltar, ther man icke [...] tullar för **bara** passagen. (SAOB, 1640).

[...] Gibraltar where you not [...] pay for only passage-the

"Gibraltar, where you do not [...] pay duty for **merely** the passage'

(3 b)   En manade den andre ut til at fäckta **bara** för skryyt skull. (Columbus, 1675)

one urged the other PL PL to fence only for boast sake

"one urged the other to fence **only** for the sake of boasting"

It is plausible that this meaning ('only') has emerged directly from the basic meaning of *bar* ('naked, uncovered'), I think, since these meanings in a sense are overlapping; a naked sword is nothing but a sword, or only a sword. It is hence not surprising to find examples that may be interpreted in either of these meanings:

(4) Så stule de bort hans swälzbalia, at han danza mädh **bara** värian. (Horn, 1657)
so stole they PL his scabbard that he danced with only rapier-the
"then they stole his scabbard, so that he danced with **only/the bare** rapier"

It also seems clear that an adjective meaning 'only' easily may be analyzed as an adverb – the abstract meaning no longer requires a nominal complement, as an element meaning 'only' also can modify events.

So, in the end of the 17:th century, *bara* carries three specific meanings: 'naked', 'obvious' (which I from now will ignore, for reasons mentioned above) and the exclusive (i. e, non-inclusive) meaning 'only', and it may function as an adjective or as an VP-adverb, but not yet as a sentence adverb or subordinator.

4. From adverb to conditional subordinator

In the end of the 17:th century, or in the first decade of the 18:th century, *bara* appears as a sentence adverb; Wijk-Andersson (1991:69f) assumes that *bara* developed from adverb to sentence adverb during the 17:th century, but only presents two examples of this new usage (1991:57f). In both of them the form of the gram is *barast*, and the source is the poet Lucidor (ca 1670, 1672). Apart from these examples, a few instances of a sentence adverbial *bara* can be found around the shift 1600/1700. The example below is from Stålhammar (1704):

(5)   Nilss [...] låter helsa sin hustru och **bara** ber att hon måtte skrifva honom till.

          Nils [...] lets greet his wife and only asks that she may write him to

          "Nils [...] sends regards to his wife and **only** asks that she may write to him"

The change from adverb to sentence adverb entails increase of syntactic scope, a type of change described by Tabor & Traugott (1998:256; cf also Roberts & Roussou 1999, Abraham 2001, Traugott & Dasher 2002:152ff), who investigate the emergence of PDE *anyway* and a few other similar grams. It is thus well known that adverbs may change into sentence adverbs, through an expansion of the syntactic scope. As for *bara*, the structural possibilities can be illustrated by the following examples, in which the underlined segments represent the scope of the corresponding English adverb *only* (cf Wijk-Andersson 1991:120, Abraham 2001:40f):

(6 a)   I can see **only** <u>Calvin</u> (and noone else).
(6 b)   I can **only** see <u>Calvin</u> (and noone else).
(6 c)   I can **only** <u>see</u> Calvin (I can not hear him).
(6 d)   I can **only** <u>see Calvin</u> (I can not see Hobbes).
(6 e)   <u>I can</u> **only** <u>see Calvin</u> (but Mary can see Hobbes)

No single part of the clause in (6 e) is stressed, an indication that it really is the entire clause that forms the focus of *only*, and thus *only* here must be classified as a sentence adverb (cf. Trask 1996:251). In the beginning of the 18:th century, *bara* could be used in precisely the same manner as *only* in (6), which implies that *bara* at this time also was (and still is) a sentence adverb (SAG[5] 4:84, Wijk-Andersson 1991:169).

   The next step in the process takes place in the first decades of the 18:th century, when the sentence adverb *bara* appears in a new meaning:

---

[5] The Swedish Academy Grammar.

(7 a)   Lät **bara** min Sissa Cammar-Piga komma fram. (Argus, 1732)

let only my Sissa chamber-maid come PL

"**just** let my chambermaid Sissa approach"

(7 b)   **Bara** lyd mig åt (SAOB, 1741)

only obey me PL

"**just** obey me"

(7 c)   Gå dumma Höna -- **bara** gå. (SAOB, 1793)

go stupid hen - - just go

"leave stupid hen – **just** leave"

Here we find that *bara* has acquired a new, not strictly exclusive meaning, which may be called desiderative (cf. Trask 1996:80), since it underlines a wish or desire. Wijk-Andersson (1991:82) considers, according to her table 3.4.3.I, this use of *bara* to be modal, and she asserts that this is a new meaning of *bara* that is developed in the 18:th century. The desiderative sentence adverb *bara* probably emerged when *bara* (in the mening 'only') was used as a sentence adverb in clauses expressing desires (imperatives, desiderative exclamations etc), whereupon it was reinterpreted by speakers who assumed that the desiderativity in these clauses was dependent on *bara*, a typical case of pragmatic inferencing (Hopper & Traugott 1993: 63ff).

The final stage in the development, the change into a conditional subordinator, seems to take place at about the same time, or shortly afterwards. The very earliest example of a conditional *bara* (8 a) can be found in a protocol from the Swedish House of Knights, in an utterance of count Lewenhaupt. Most early examples of conditional *bara*, such as (8 b - 8 d), actually appear in spoken contexts, it seems. (8 b) is a comic comment in the colloquial magazine *Argus* and (8 c) is spoken line in a comedy (in the context, which otherwise is ridicously highbrow, it is clearly informal). Also (8 d) is written as direct speech. In her samples from *Argus*, Wijk-Andersson (1991:77) finds eight instances of *bara*, of which four

comes from a chapter about the folly of servants (like 8 b). She points out (1991:78, 83) that in the 18:th century *bara* did indeed belong to contexts of ordinary life; it is at this time unceremonious and down-to-earth, a statement confirmed by SAOB (B 3476).

(8 a) Vij skrida til vahlet, **bara** vij intet taga någon utom Riddarhuset. (SAOB, 1726)
we go to election-the only we not take anyone outside House of Knights-the
"we proceed to elections, **if** we **just** do not take anyone outside the house of lords"

(8 b) Gerna, **bara** hon intet will wara olåtig: Hon skal kunna
giöra god Ragout utan Champignon [...] (Argus, 1732)
gladly, only she not will be unpractical she shall be-able-to
make good ragout without mushroom [...]
'with delight, **if** she **just** is not unpractical. She must be able
to make nice ragout without mushrooms [...]'

(8 c) det bästa är at han bär hiertat tämeligen lågt i böxorne, så at **bara** jag ser på
mitt steke-spett här, så kusar han som en hund. (Gyllenborg, 1737)
the best is that he carries heart-the quite low in trousers-the so that only I look at
my skewer here then crouches he like a dog
"the best thing is that he carries his heart quite low in his trousers, so that **if** I **just**
glance at my skewer here, then he crouches like a dog"

(8 d) [...] **bara** jag får se er så glömmer jag bort altihop. (SAOB, 1786)
[...] only I may see you then forget I everything
"**if** I **just** get to see you, then I forget everything"

In (8 c, d), *bara* appears with the properties of a typical conditional subordinator – it is clearly the initial word in the protasis, and the apodosis is headed by *så* (*then*).

An explanation for this development may be that as a desiderative sentence adverb,   *bara* typically appeared in non-assertive or hypothetical clauses; one can not wish a fact. Such clauses often occur juxtaposed with the predicted consequence of the fulfilled desire – in (7 a) the chamber maid is for instance expected to reveal to latest gossip about another noble lady.

Given that *bara* appeared in hypothetical clauses that sometimes were followed by a clause where the desired result was presented, the two basic semantic features of a conditional sentence were present: hypotheticality and causality (cf. Comrie 1986). Hypotheticality is a necessary feature of desiderative clauses, and causality is often inferred from a temporal sequence (*post hoc ergo propter hoc*). From a more general perspective, we know that adverbs often are recruited as subordinators (like *after*, *before* and *since*), and we know that modal expressions may serve as sources for conditionals (Hopper & Traugott 1993:179). Indeed, the Mandarin *yào* can, according to Hopper & Traugott, convey several related meanings: 'wish, be necessary, if'. The semantic resemblance to desiderative *bara* is obvious. These circumstances all suggest that it must have been a relatively small step for the language user to start using the desiderative sentence adverb *bara* also as a conditional subordinator.

   The chronology of the development of conditional   *bara* is a bit unsatisfactory, from a language historian's point of view. When working with texts from such a late period, one would expect to find clear examples of all the relevant stages, neatly following each other and eventually leading to the goal, the conditional subordinator. In the case of *bara*, the really crucial stages and the goal nonetheless appear simultanously. But I still propose that there is a successive development, and I think that the reason why it is not observable is that *bara* initially was used only in colloquial speech, and hence belonged to a style that was not written in any extent until it was too late – the change had already taken place. Subordinating *bara* has furthermore never been frequent, as it has been competing with other conditional subordinators such as the default *om* and its more formal counterparts *allena* and *blott*. The scarcity of conditional *bara* makes the change even harder to observe.

5. Some other relevant grams

The topic of Wijk-Andersson's dissertation (1991) is *bara* and its equivalents *blott*, *enbart*, *endast*, *uteslutande* and *allena/allenast*. Here, *allenast* and *blott* are our main interest, since they have been regularly used as conditional subordinators in Swedish.[6] Also *endast* was used as a conditional subordinator for a short period, and it will be studied in comparison with *enbart*, which did not evolve into a conditional.

   Allena can be found in EOSw, and as English *alone* it was originally a compound of the parts *all* and *ena* (*'one'*), meaning 'solo', like the German *allein*. In EOSw (Söderwall I:27), *allena* could, either as an adjective or an adverb, also mean 'only'. *Allenast* is according to SAOB (A 995) an inflected form of *allena*. In OSw, it had the meaning 'only' (Söderwall I:27). Interestingly, *allenast*, but not *allena*, developed into a conditional subordinator:

> (10)   Om någon [...] wil i Fastan gifta sig, bör sådant icke wägras, **allenast** thet skeer i
>   stillheet, och utan alt Brudebång. (SAOB, 1686)
>   if anyone [...] want in Lent marry refl. should such not denied-be, only it happens in
>   silence and without all bridenoise
>   "if anyone [...] wants to marry during Lent, then that should not be denied, **if** it **just**
>   occurs in silence and without any marital noise"

The pair *allena*/*allenast*, which have precisely the same etymological background, thus offers an interesting asymmetry.

   Likewise, the pair *enbart* and *endast* developed differently, although they have very similar backgrounds. *Enbart* is, according to SAOB (E 583) the adverbial form of the adjective *enbar*. The adjective is, in its turn, originally a compound of the numeral *en* ('one') and the adjective *bar*, which of course also was the origin of *bara*. Like the other grams in this group,

---

[6] *Allena* is not used as a conditional in contemporary Swedish, but conditional *blott* may still appear in formal, poetic or archaic contexts.

the adjective *enbar* developed an exclusive meaning 'only', and an adverbial, in the form *enbart*, was used with the same meaning in the end of the 19:th century.

Endast is also the offspring of an adjective, *ende* (SAOB, E 588), in the same pattern as *barast* and *allenast*. The original meaning of *ende* is probably 'alone', but as one of its submeanings *ende* meant 'only'. In contrast to *enbart*, *endast* developed further. In the end of the 18:th century (the example below is from SAOB, dated 1781), we find *endast* in use as a conditional subordinator:

(11) Vi hafve intet så ondt om Patrioter **endast** de hinna med blifva kända.
      we have not so PL PL patriots only they manage PL become known
      "we have no shortage of patriots, **if** they **just** get time to become known"

The adjective *blott* was borrowed from Low German (*bloß*) in the Middle Ages (Hellquist 1980: 81). In OSw it had meanings like 'naked' or 'defenseless' (Söderwall I:127), but in EMSw it could mean 'only, mere'. Later, an adverbial *blott* shows up, also in the meaning 'only', and in the early 18:th century, we find a conditional combination *blott att*. About half a century later, *blott* can be used as a bare conditional subordinator:

(12) Han är nögd, **blott** han får detta (SAOB, 1773)
      he is satisfied only he receives this
      "he is satisfied, **if** he **just** receives this"

So, these quite similar grams (*bara*, *blott*, *allena*, *allenast*, *endast* and *enbart*) all aquired exclusive meaning, but only four of them developed further into conditional subordinators. A closer study reveals what appears to be the key factor: *bara*, *blott*, *allenast* and *endast* could actually also be used as desiderative sentence adverbs. Hence we find a very strong correlation between desiderative and conditional meaning:

gram	exclusive	desiderative	conditional
bara	yes	yes	yes
blott	yes	yes	yes
allena	yes	no	no
allenast	yes	yes	yes
enbart	yes	no	no
endast	yes	yes	yes

Table 1: Correlation between desiderative and conditional meaning.

Although I have not been able to establish an undisputable chronological development for all of these grams at this stage, I find it plausible that there is a path of meaning change from exclusive to desiderative and further on to conditional meaning.[7] I also think that the reason why desiderativity is crucial is that desiderative clauses may be the only context in which grams of this type may aquire the semantic feature of hypotheticality. Hypotheticality, in turn, is an essential meaning component of conditional sentences (Comrie 1986).

6. The changes of **bara***: a case of grammaticalization?*

The development of *bara* consists of semantic as well as syntactic changes. In this section, both of these aspects are discussed, from the perspective of grammaticalization theory. I also comment upon the mechanisms of change that are involved in the evolution of *bara*.

6.1. *The semantic aspects of the proposed path of change*

Some of the most prominent semantic components of grammaticalization theory are semantic retention and source determination (Bybee et al 1994:chapter 1), abstraction (Heine et al

---

[7] Eckardt (2003; cf also Abraham 2001) has shown that also German *bloß* can be used both as an exclusive and as a desiderative adverb.

1991:48) and subjectification (Traugott 1980, 1982, 1989, 1995, Traugott & Dasher 2002:89ff). Here I investigate whether the changes of *bara* fit into these models of change.

As was mentioned in the introduction, conditional *bara* signals explicit suffiency ('if just X, then Y'). The origin of this meaning component is, I think, the basic meaning of *bara* ('uncovered', 'bare'), which, arguably, contains a sense of negation. SAG (IV:161ff) claims that a streak of negativity also is present in the exclusive as well as the desiderative meanings, which both can be paraphrased as 'no more than'. It is probable that this feature is present also in the conditional subordinator, resulting in the explicit sufficiency of MSw *bara* – if so, this is an instance of both semantic retention and source determination.

Bara also follows Heine et als' proposed path of change (1991:48); as an adjective *bara* modifies Objects, as an adverb it modifies Activities, and as a subordinator I assume it must be categorized as an item that belongs to the "most fuzzy" (Heine et al 1991:49) of these categories, i.e. Quality.

Turning to subjectification, it again seems that the changes of *bara* proceeds as could be expected (from this particular perspective). In Traugott´s original version of the concept (1980: 51f, 1982, 1989)[8], subjectification was seen as a shift of functional-semantic meaning type (from propositional to textual to interpersonal meaning). Adjectival *bara* does indeed belong to the propositional level, expressing a lexical meaning. The adverbial *bara* falls into the textual level, however, and as the adverbial *bara* aquires the speaker oriented meaning of desiderativity, it also changes functional-semantic status, from textual to interpersonal level of meaning.

All in all, the semantic aspects of the changes of *bara* indicate that we are dealing with an uncontroversial example of grammaticalization.

---

[8] In later work (Traugott 19995, Traugott & Dasher 2002:89ff), Traugott has abandoned the theoretical foundation of subjectification, i.e. the hypothesis presented by Halliday & Hasan (1976), but the actual concept of subjectification remains more or less unaltered.

6.2. *The syntactic aspects of the proposed path of change*

The predominant view on structural change within grammaticalization theory is, at least since Givón (1979:209), that grammaticalization involves a decrease of syntactic scope: "The structural scope of a sign decreases with increasing grammaticalization" (Lehmann 1995:143). A change of the type described here can then not be considered to be a case of grammaticalization, as both adverbs and subordinators have wider scope than adjectives. But it has been suggested that also increase of structural scope may be a possible property of grammaticalization; Tabor & Traugott (1998) and Roberts & Roussou (1999) both propose (although working within quite different linguistic frameworks) that a scope increasing change indeed can be classified as grammaticalization – Roberts & Roussou actually claim that this is the defining feature of grammaticalization, from the syntactic point of view.

These conflicting assumptions concerning scope increase/decrease may be caused by an oversight; in grammaticalization theory, much attention has been paid to the semantic aspects of the investigated changes (cf Heine et al 1991, Bybee et al 1994), as grammaticalization has been seen as loss of lexical meaning intertwined with acquisition of grammatical meaning. However, not only items with narrow scope, such as affixes and clitics, express grammatical (i.e, non-lexical) meaning, but so do items with clausal scope: modal verbs, subordinators, coordinators and sentence adverbs (cf Abraham 2001). There should thus be nothing remarkable about a grammaticalization process in which the gram, like *bara*, goes through an increase of syntactic scope during the semantic changes.

6.3. *The mechanisms of change*

My intention has been to describe both the syntactic and the semantic aspects of the evolution of conditional *bara*. In order to reach a deeper understanding of the triggering factors and of the active mechanisms of change, a theory which encompasses both of these aspects and

which does not exclude structural scope increase is necessary.[9] In the pursuit of such a theory, it is reasonable, I think, to depart from the observation that the changes can be seen as interacting structural reanalyses and semantic reinterpretations. Furthermore, the reanalyses do not seem to alter the meaning of *bara*, and the reinterpretations, conversely, do not affect the structural status of *bara*. I propose that the crucial factors in these changes are (structural) ambiguity and (semantic) vagueness.[10]

As an adjective, *bara* is vague; it can mean 'uncovered' and 'only', and a number of intermediate meanings. In many cases, it is not easy to specify the exact difference between these meanings. The initial reanalysis (adjective > adverb) dissolved the vagueness, since *bara* as an adverb solely means 'only'. However, as an adverb *bara* could either be analyzed as a regular (VP-) adverb or as a sentence adverb – the adverbial *bara* (meaning 'only') is thus structurally ambiguous. The following change, when desiderative meaning rubbed off on *bara* through pragmatic inferencing, in turn resulted in an unambiguous sentence adverb, since desiderativity clearly is a sentential type of meaning. But also this stage of development led on to further change. *Bara* could, as a desiderative sentence adverb, be interpreted as a conditional gram in the proper contexts – again this is a question of vagueness, I think, since the semantic difference between a conditional clausal relation and a sequential/temporal clausal relation in many cases is hard to capture accurately. The final reanalysis (sentence adverb > subordinator) resulted in an unambiguous, non-vague conditional subordinator.[11]

So, I suggest that the evolution of *bara* can be seen as interacting semantic reinterpretations, facilitated by structural ambiguity, and structural reanalyses, possibly triggered by vagueness.

---

[9] One such theory is Hopper & Traugotts´(1993:88) model of grammaticalization, in which they consider grammaticalization to be a succession of changes that either proceed by reanalysis/metonymy or by analogy/metaphor. However, I do not find this model to be applicable in this particular case.

[10] Tuggy (1993) discusses vagueness/polysemy as well as ambiguity/homonymy; here I transfer his view of ambiguity to the structural domain of language.

[11] However, since all meanings and functions of *bara* still are in use in MSw, there are of course constructions in which *bara* still is either ambiguous or vague. But in some cases *bara* is an undisputable conditional subordinator.

diachronic stage	ambiguous	vague
adjectival *bara* ('uncovered, only')	no	yes
adverbial *bara* ('only')	yes	no
sent. adverbial *bara* (desiderative 'only')	no	yes
subordinating *bara* ('if just')	no	no

Table 2: The evolution of *bara* seen as interacting reinterpretations and reanalyses.

This perspective of grammaticalization also have implications for the formal/functional debate (cf. Newmeyer 1998, Haspelmath 1998) concerning gradual and non-gradual change. Most work within grammaticalization theory has been focussed on semantic changes, and if one of the key factors in semantic change is vagueness, as suggested here, then it is natural to assume a principle of gradualness, I think. Vague meanings can not be easily delineated or categorized – they are rather points on a scale than distinct alternatives of interpretation. On the other hand, a structural analysis of a sentence is rarely vague. Consider the sentence below:

(13)   Calvin gave the farmer his money.

Example (13) offers two analytical options; either *his* refers to *Calvin* or to *the farmer*. There are thus two distinctly different structural analyses available (with two separate meanings, in this case). The alternatives are non-gradual – there are no intermediate analyses – and the sentence is thus structurally ambiguous. To me, it seems likely that the syntactic domain of language is organized in discrete categories, while the semantic domain is "fluid, gradient and

variable" (Bybee 2003). Accordingly, syntactic change will generally be abrupt, whereas semantic change will be gradual.

In the model sketched here, non-gradual syntactic changes (reanalyses) accompany gradual semantic changes (reinterpretations), and there is no opposition between gradual and non-gradual change – the semantic and syntactic changes interact and enable further change throughout the evolution of *bara*. It is plausible, I think, that similar forms of semantic/syntactic interaction have been active in other languages and in other cases of grammaticalization. A perspective of grammaticalization which includes both of these aspects of language is a prerequisite for future work along these lines.

References

Abraham, Werner. 2001. "How far does semantic bleaching go: About grammaticalization that does not terminate in functional categories". *Grammatical relations and change*, ed. by J-T. Faarlund, 15-64. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar*. The U. of Chicago Press, Chicago/London.

Bybee, Joan. 2003. "The development of the category of auxiliary in English". Talk presented at ICHL 16, Copenhagen.

Comrie, Bernard. 1986. "Conditionals: a typology". *On conditionals,* ed. by Elizabeth Closs Traugott, Alice ter Meulen, Judy Snitzer Reilly and Charles A. Ferguson, 77-102. CUP, Cambridge.

Declerck, Renaat. & Susan Reed. 2001. *Conditionals. A comprehensive empirical analysis*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York.

Eckardt, Regine. 2003. "A two-way pathway of change". Talk presented at ICHL 16, Copenhagen.

Givón, Talmy. 1979. *On understanding grammar*. Academic Press, NewYork/San Francisco/ London.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Ruqaia Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. Routledge, London.

Hanssen, Eskil, Else Mundal & Kåre Skadberg, K. 1975. *Norrøn grammatik*. Universitetsforlaget, Oslo/Bergen/Tromsø.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1998. "Does grammaticalization need reanalysis?". *Studies in Language* 22-2:315-351.

Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi & Friederike Hünnemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization. A conceptual framework*. The U. of Chicago Press, Chicago/London.

Hellquist, Elof. 1980. *Svensk etymologisk ordbok*. Liber, Lund.

Hopper, Paul & Elizabeth Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. CUP, Cambridge.

van Kemenade, Ans. 1999. "Functional categories, morphosyntactic change, grammaticalization". *Linguistics* 37, 997-1010.

Lehmann, Christian. 1995. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. Lincom Europa, München/Newcastle.

Newmeyer, Frederick. 1998. *Language Form and Language Function*. MIT Press, Cambridge/MA.

Pfeifer, Wolfgang. 1989. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen*, I-III. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.

Roberts, Ian & Anna Roussou. 1999. "A formal approach to 'grammaticalization'". *Linguistics* 37, 1011-1042.

SAG (*Svenska Akademiens Grammatik*), I-IV. 1999. Ulf Teleman, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. Svenska Akademien, Stockholm.

SAOB (*Svenska Akademiens Ordbok*). 1873-. Svenska Akademien, Lund.

Sweetser, Eve. 1988. "Grammaticalization and semantic bleaching". *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 14:389-405.

Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics*. CUP, Cambridge.

Söderwall, Knut F. 1884-1973. *Ordbok över svenska medeltidsspråket*, I-IV.

Tabor, Whitney & Elizabeth Traugott. 1998. "Structural scope expansion and grammaticalization". *The limits of grammaticalization*, ed. by Anna Ramat & Paul Hopper, 229-272. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Trask, Robert. 1996. *A dictionary of grammatical terms in linguistics*. Routledge, New York.

Traugott, Elizabeth. 1980. "Meaning-change in the development of grammatical markers."
Language Sciences 2, 44-61.

Traugott, Elizabeth. 1982. "From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: some
semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization". *Perspectives on Historical
Linguistics*, ed. by W. Lehmann & Y. Malkel, 245-271. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Traugott, Elizabeth. 1989. "On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: an example of
subjectification in semantic change". *Language* 65, 289-307.

Traugott, Elizabeth. 1995. "Subjectification in grammaticalization". *Subjectivity and
subjectivisation*, 31-54. Ed. Stein, D & Wright, S. CUP, Cambridge.

Traugott, Elizabeth. & Richard Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in semantic change*. CUP,
Cambridge.

Tuggy, David. 1993. "Ambiguity, polysemy and vagueness". *Cognitive Linguistics* 4:3, 273-
290.

Wijk-Andersson, Elsie. 1991. Bara *i fokus*. The Dep. of Scandinavian languages,
Uppsala University.