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This book has two related goals. On the one hand, we wish to address the question of syntactic change in the context of the minimalist programme, by using (variants of) some of the technical devices that have been proposed in order to provide a general analysis of a pervasive diachronic phenomenon, grammaticalization. On the other hand, we wish to address a deeper question raised by the nature of the minimalist programme itself. A central idea behind the minimalist programme is the idea that language is in some sense a perfect system (the strong minimalist thesis). Now, perfect systems do not vary over time, so the very existence of syntactic change appears to be a challenge to this thesis. (i) The existence of synchronic variation among grammatical systems also poses an apparent problem for the strong minimalist thesis. The account of grammaticalization that we develop will lead to what we believe to be an interesting response to this problem, and an explanation for the existence of apparent variation and change in syntactic systems which we believe to be consistent with the strong minimalist thesis.

The term grammaticalization was first introduced by Meillet (1912) to describe the development of new grammatical (functional) material out of 'autonomous' words. Since then the topic has received much attention in the literature on language change, especially amongst typologists. As Hopper and Traugott (1993:1-2) point out, the term 'grammaticalization' can be used to describe either the framework that considers 'how new grammatical forms and constructions arise' or 'the processes whereby items become more grammatical through time'. The primary empirical goal of this book is to provide a general characterization of the diachronic phenomenon of grammaticalization within a modified version of Chomsky's (1995, 2000) minimalist framework, combined with an approach to language change of the kind argued for by Lightfoot (1979, 1991, 1998), Clark and Roberts (1993) and Roberts (2001). We do this by developing the basic idea that grammaticalization involves the creation of new functional material, either through the reanalysis of existing functional material or through the reanalysis of lexical material. Within the set of assumptions we adopt, there is no need to treat grammaticalization as a separate framework, or for that matter as a distinct process of the grammar. Thus our central claims are: (a) that grammaticalization is a regular case of parameter change not fundamentally different from other such changes; (b) (c) grammaticalization is therefore epiphenomenal, as recently argued by Newmeyer (1998), Joseph (2001a). This brings us to our main theoretical goal, which is to provide an understanding of the nature of functional categories, using grammaticalization as our tool, since it creates new functional material. We thus aim at providing a way of identifying the inventory of potential functional categories in the grammar of natural language.

We have just mentioned what we see as the basic nature of grammaticalization. Let us expand on this idea a little more; in Chapters 2 to 4 we discuss numerous cases, analysing them all in broadly the same way. In all these cases, we argue that grammaticalization is the creation of new functional material. It must, then, involve some sort of categorial reanalysis of lexical or functional material. The main question is how this kind of change can be captured formally. In what follows, we develop an account in terms of the central idea that such a change always involves structural simplification. The idea can be illustrated in simplified form with the development of the future expression in tha + VP, where tha is the future marker, from thēlo + subordinate clause, where thēlo is a verb, in the history of Greek. It is clear that the Post-Classical Greek construction consisted of a biclausal structure, in that thēlo heads a VP associated with the full panoply of functional material, including a subordinate clause introduced by the complementizer hima. On the other hand, the Modern Greek construction with tha is standardly analysed as monoclausal, since both the verb and tha occur in the same clause. At the very least, then, (c) the grammaticalization of thēlo to tha involves the associated structural simplification in (i) (here CP is the clause, or Complementizer Phrase):

(i) \[ CP \ldots [VP thēlo CP]] \succ [CP \ldots tha VP]]
This change is a structural simplification at least in that the earlier structure contained two CP nodes, while the later one contains just a single CP. In Chapter 5 we will develop an account of language change which derives the fact that structural simplification is a natural mechanism of change, and therefore the fact that grammaticalization is a widespread and natural kind of change. Our general characterization of grammaticalization, then, is that it is a categorial reanalysis which creates new functional material, and that this reanalysis always involves structural simplification.

This kind of change is extremely prevalent across languages. Auxiliaries typically derive from ‘full’ verbs (the English modals are a much discussed and typical example). Detenninners and pronouns often derive from demonstratives (all the Romance determiners and 3rd-person pronouns are reflexes of one of the two Latin demonstratives ille and ipse). Complementizers derive from demonstratives (English that), relative pronouns (Romance que/che), prepositions (English for), verbs of saying (e.g. Ewe be), etc. Heine and Kuteva (2002) provide an inventory of literally hundreds of cases of this kind of change.

In the typological literature where these and other changes have been documented, and the evidence for diachronic pathways has been accumulated, grammaticalization has been claimed to be universal. Indeed, Meillet (1912) pointed out that the process was one of only two ways in which new grammatical material could arise, the other being analogy (new paradigms developing by formal resemblance to existing paradigms). Our account of grammaticalization must thus explain this ubiquity. To this end we introduce the notion of markedness into the theory of parameters in Chapter 5.

The claim that grammaticalization follows a pathway of language change, that is, expresses a tendency, poses a challenge to the standard Principles and Parameters approach to syntactic change, whose exact nature we describe in detail directly. We thus see that in pursuing our analysis of grammaticalization, a number of theoretical issues that are of importance for both synchronic and diachronic syntax must be addressed. These questions all revolve around the familiar tension between empirical coverage and explanatory depth, which has been highlighted by Chomsky repeatedly since the 1960s. In a sense, then, the deeper purpose of the book is an attempt to deal with this tension in the diachronic domain, paying particular attention to the descriptive and explanatory potential of the notion of functional categories.

In the diachronic domain, the principal theoretical question that arises is whether language change is a deterministic process (as language acquisition is for example). In other words, the issue is whether we can identify clear pathways of change that make languages converge onto certain parametric settings. In the context of the theory of principles and parameters (whether in its minimalist manifestation or otherwise), we can view parameters as creating a space of possible variation within which grammatical systems are distributed. The natural view of synchronic variation among grammatical systems is to think of them as randomly scattered in this space; and the natural view of diachronic change is to see it as a random ‘walk’ around this space. The prediction is then that there are no pathways or ‘drift’ in diachronic change, a view which has been consistently and vigorously defended by Lightfoot. This view is theoretically cogent, and to the extent that seeing syntactic change as parametric change is the key to an explanatory account of syntactic change (as we believe, with Lightfoot, that it is), then we are led to the view that there cannot be pathways, drift or natural tendencies in syntactic change. However, the phenomena of grammaticalization provide ample evidence of just such pathways or tendencies, and thus syntactic change must — at the very least at the descriptive level — be in a significant sense non-random.

At this point then we seem to reach a paradox: on the one hand we accept that parameter changes cannot follow pathways. On the other hand, by acknowledging the prevalence of grammaticalization we appear to also accept that syntactic change follows some pathways. One way of resolving this paradox is to deny that whatever we have identified as grammaticalization exists. This is a logically viable option, but at the same time it goes against the empirical evidence. What this apparent paradox boils down to is a deeper theoretical question, namely that of reconciling the clear evidence for pathways of change at the descriptive level with the fact that an explanatory account of change must involve parameter change. We will propose in Chapter 5 that this can be done in terms of a theory of markedness which has the effect of creating ‘basins of attraction’ (in the sense of complexity theory) within the parameter space. In this way, we retain the explanatory force of the notion of parametric change, but make it compatible with the evidence that changes tend naturally to go in certain directions and not others — grammaticalization being a prime example. More generally, we see this as a way of reconciling the tension between descriptive and explanatory adequacy in diachronic syntax (and possibly in language typology).

[Adapted from Ian Roberts and Anna Roussou (2003), Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization, Cambridge University Press.]
問1 下線部（1）を日本語に訳しなさい。

問2 下線部（2）についてその内容を本文に即して説明しなさい。

問3 下線部（3）の具体的内容を本文に即して述べなさい。
問4 下線部（4）のpathwaysは、ここではどのような概念を表すのに用いられているかを述べなさい。


問5 下線部（5）の具体的内容を本文に即して述べなさい。