Gerhalter, Katharina (2020): Paradigmas y polifuncionalidad. Estudio diacrónico de *preciso / precisamente, justo / justamente, exacto / exactamente* y *cabal / cabalmente*. Berlin: De Gruyter (*Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, 448).

This book deals with the historical development of a group of four Spanish adjectives and adverbs: *preciso / precisamente, justo / justamente, exacto / exactamente* and *cabal / cabalmente*. Based on large diachronic data samples from the *Corpus del Nuevo Diccionario Histórico*, this study combines quantitative and qualitative analysis as well as semasiological and onomasiological approaches. The results are discussed regarding current theories of language change (grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, thetical grammar and cooptation) and regarding explanatory factors such as analogy and changes in frequency.

The first part analyses each adjective-adverb pair separately from a semasiological perspective. It focuses on the origin of these lexemes and their several semantic changes which can be observed in the corpus. The data shows that *cabal / cabalmente* are the first of the adjectives and adverbs expressing exactness (as they appear in the 13th century) and that they belong to the popular tradition, whereas *justo / justamente, preciso / precisamente* and *exacto / exactamente* are learned loan words from Latin. Since the 16th century, the evolution of these polysemous adjectives and adverbs converge and they form the semantic field of adjectives and adverbs expressing exactness. They occur especially in the domain of measures, numbers, specifications of space and time, language, and scientific and mathematic descriptions. From an onomasiological point of view, they can be grouped to one paradigm since they can be exchanged in several contexts. Thus, the adverbs of the exactness-domain show parallel syntactic polyfunctionality. However, each lexical pair retains specific semantic nuances inherited from their lexical origins. Additionally, the corpus data shows some differences regarding frequency between present-day European and American Spanish varieties, which are interpreted as diverging preferences for one lexeme or another.

The paradigm develops procedural meanings and, therefore, pragmatic functions, especially between the 17th and 19th centuries. This leads to a further increase in their polyfunctionality. Hence, the second part of the book deals with three discourse functions shared by more or less all adjectives and adverbs of the exactness-paradigm: focalization, affirmation and reformulation. Those changes show parallel as well as diverging shifts, since different adverbs specialize in different (sub-)functions. The corpus analysis shows that the development of each discourse function is led by one single adjective or adverb. The others follow these paths later and may not adopt all shades of meaning. Therefore, we assume analogy to be an important factor and called "paradigmatic effect" those shifts in single adverbs or adjectives that can only be explained considering the whole paradigm. An isolated analysis of each lexeme, without considering the rest of the paradigm, would not be sufficient and would not show theoretically understandable language changes.

The first discourse function is that of focus adverbs which emphasize a surprising or significative piece of information. They often reveal subjective attitudes and emotions of the speaker, for example *pasa justo hoy* ('that happens exactly today, of all days') and *precisamente por eso* ('quite the contrary: precisely because of that'). Focalization and its several subjective nuances and pragmatic subfunctions are gradually developed mainly by *precisamente* starting from the 16th and 17th centuries (gradual pragmaticalization or subjectification). On the other hand, the few examples of *cabalmente* as a focus adverb can only be explained as imitation of *precisamente*. Due to the "paradigmatic effect", the focus adverbs *cabalmente, justamente* and *justo* reach the same level of syntactic and pragmatic polyfunctionality as their predecessor *precisamente*. Besides, *exactamente* independently develops its own subfunctions as a focus adverb (e.g., in questions and in comparative structures).

The second discourse function is affirmation. In dialogs, adjectives and adverbs of the exactness-domain are used as discourse markers that confirm a supposition of the interlocutor, for example *exacto* 'yes,

exactly'. The historical corpus analysis shows that *cabalmente* and *cabal* are the first ones used as confirmation markers (18th century), and that all other adjectives and adverbs adopt successively that new function. The inventory of confirmation markers changes faster than other types of grammatical or semantic changes usually do. This is characteristic for the accelerated rise and fall of discourse markers in spoken language. The analysis of the corpus data shows that this discourse function does not develop from step-by-step ellipsis, but from an *ad-hoc* cooptation. Contrarily to what is often suggested in literature on discourse markers, *cabal, justo, preciso* and *exacto* as affirmation markers can be directly related to their underlying adjectival nature, and not necessarily to adverbial functions.

The third discourse function is reformulation. The locutions *más exactamente / más precisamente* ('more precisely/exactly') and the semi-locutions *para ser (más) exacto(s) / preciso(s)* ('to be exact, precise') introduce a segment that reformulates something previously stated. This function can also be explained by cooptation, but it is developed step-by-step via ellipsis by *para ser (más) exacto(s)* and *más más exactamente* during the 19th century. It is transferred later to parallel structures containing *precisamente* and *preciso*. Again, an isolated analysis of *más precisamente / para ser más precisos* would be inadequate since the historical development as reformulation markers can only be observed and explained with the correlates *exacto / exactamente*. Therefore, it is necessary to differentiate between "innovative cooptation" and "cooptation by analogy" (following an already existing path). Finally, this analysis also contributes to a better differentiation between three similar discourse-strategies: reformulation, correction and paraphrasis. Whereas these concepts have been widely discussed based on polyfunctional and highly grammaticalized markers such as *o sea*, the analysis of monofunctional and non-grammaticalized reformulation markers such as *más exactamente* shows a clearer delimitation of reformulation opposed to paraphrasis and correction.

Within the analyzed paradigm, the three discourse functions (focalization, affirmation, reformulation) develop independently from each other and each of the procedural meanings is based on the basic semantic concept of exactness in different domains, i.e. language, space and time, measures. The three discourse functions diverge mainly in syntax (position, scope) and their pragmatic instructions. The research results are interpreted within the theoretical frameworks of subjectification (or grammaticalization in a broad sense, or pragmaticalization) and of cooptation (within the model of thetical grammar). It turns out that both models – which generally are seen as contradictory – complement each other since they describe genuinely different kinds of language change. On the one hand, subjectification is a gradual development of contextual inferences that lead to higher syntactic flexibility and higher pragmatic polyfunctionality, and more expressiveness. This path is observed for focus adverbs, especially for *precisamente*, which expresses subjective values. On the other hand, cooptation is the model that best suits the instantaneous, non-gradual and non-inferential creation of extra-clausal discourse markers used solely for affirmation and reformulation. Therefore, different types of change lead to different results.

We conclude that cooptation and subjectification (or pragmaticalization) may occur simultaneously and independently, and that both models should be combined in order to comprehensively describe the evolution of pragmatic functions. Finally, analogy is decisive for both types of language change. Our study also identifies those factors that may block the so-called "paradigmatic effect": not all adjectives and adverbs of the paradigm adopt all pragmatic subfunctions and nuances, because in some cases "disturbing" polysemy and specific semantic nuances that are retained of their lexical origin (*justo, exacto, preciso, cabal*) are incompatible with a certain new procedural meaning.