J. Diego Quesada

De ahí > diay

A Particle is born.

Discourse-triggered Grammaticalization in Spanish*

0. Introduction

A central concept in contemporary linguistic theory is *grammaticalization*; it is used to refer to a process whose role consists in the organization of categories that constitute the physiognomy of every language; akin to it are aspects such as its role in language change as well as the nature, causes and modality of the process. The last mentioned aspect has to do with the paths through which grammaticalization (re)shapes the grammatical component of a language. Basically, there are two paths: "the lexical item > morpheme model and the discourse > morphosyntax perspective" (Traugott & Heine 1991: 2 ff). In brief, the former concerns a single unit as affected by the process (scope reduction, semantic bleaching, paradigmaticization, and reduced syntactic variability); an example of that would be a verb on its way to auxiliary. In the latter, a form or construction which previously enjoyed certain pragmatically determined variability and flexibility becomes syntacticized. This paper analyses the grammaticalization of the adverbial phrase *de ahí* to particle *diay* and its phonetic variants (*diy*, *yay*, *iey*, etc.) in Costa Rican colloquial Spanish as a particular manifestation of (primarily) the second grammaticalization path. This case represents the shift in function of an adverbial phrase from "objective" indication of a series of events (with some causative meaning too) at the sentence level to the expression of subjective evaluation at the textual level; the parallelism between form and function (isomorphic reduction), typical of the grammaticalization process, is also shown in the sequence: deictic adverb (*de ahí*) > sequencer (*de ahí*) > causative particle (*diay*) > subjective (text-assessing) particle (*diay* with phonetic variants). The grammaticalization of *diay* represents an instance of "the discourse > morphosyntax perspective" insofar as a. a new morpheme has emerged whose functions are discourse-pragmatic, b. higher stages of grammaticalization of the morpheme stand for a shift from the sentential to the textual level, and c. the use of the particle is speaker-based and context dependent (its

* Excerpts of this paper were read at the 41st. Annual Meeting of the International Linguistic Association held at New York University, New York, in April 1996.

use obeys pragmatic functions rather than syntactic rules). This shift seems to contradict the nature of the discourse > morphosyntax path in that the particle's function transcends the sentence level, but this is due to the nature of particles; as the analysis will show, the process as such is discursive in essence. In its way to consolidation as the particle *par excellence* of Costa Rican (and to some extent Nicaraguan) Spanish, *diay* has undergone various discursive functions, all of which will be dealt with in the paper, that at a first glance may look disparate. An analysis based on the *function contiguity hypothesis* (see 3.2.), however, clearly shows the metaphoric/metonymic extension of the core "ablative" meaning of the adverbial phrase *de ahí*.

Although the phenomenon under investigation is geographically confined, the objective of this study is not "dialectological":¹ rather, it intends to illustrate, with data from a specific language variety, how discourse-triggered grammaticalization proceeds and what consequences it brings about to the meanings/forms "affected" by it. The data for the study stem from a. colonial manuscripts, b. literary pieces of Costa Rican authors between 1895–1967, and c. recorded interviews carried out in the summer of 1991 in Costa Rica.² The development of the particle in question is interesting for two reasons; first, it advances a grammatical category which is not characteristic of Spanish (as opposed to, say, German); and second, it represents an instance of the discourse > morphosyntax grammaticalization path. Section 2. makes a short reference to the phenomenon of grammaticalization, while Section 3. deals with the grammaticalization of *diay* and the functions it now fulfills. Finally, Section 4. briefly considers the typological implications of this phenomenon.

1 Eugenio Chang-Rodríguez (personal communication) mentions "having heard" the form *diay* in the Andean Region. Since there is no study on this particle as used in that region and since Chang-Rodríguez's remark did not go beyond mentioning this fact, this study will exclusively deal with *diay* as used in Costa Rican speech, where there is attested documentation of its development.

2 The speakers are 7 males and 7 females – ages 20 to 60 –, education not exceeding high school. The data will show the following indexing: (XX-X-N°), where XX = initials (name and last name); X = initial of the province of origin (SJ = San José, A = Alajuela, C = Cartago, H = Heredia); N° = age: 1 (to 30), 2 (30 to 50) or 3 (50 on). The transcription was intended to reproduce actual speech as accurately as possible; thus contractions, "errors", slips of the tongue, and the like will appear in the examples. In terms of notation, / means change of word, idea or correction by the speaker, // means pause, // stands for long pause; geminated segments merely reproduce speech,⁷ means that there was a change of word, idea, or correction and a glottal stop was articulated for that; finally, ... means hesitation by the speaker.

1. *Particles as a part of speech*

1.1. Definition and delimitation

The term *particle* had been used until recently as a cover term for such closed parts-of-speech-classes as interjection, adverb, conjunction, etc. The main criterion for that was the lack of inflection of these words. This resulted in both an extremely heterogeneous word class and huge lists of "particles" in the individual languages described; from the point of view of a general theory of particles this was a flaw; it suffices to mention the fact that inflection is not a reliable criterion since it is not applicable to all languages. To define what a particle is, Weydt & Hentschel (1989) depart from the basic differences in the type of meaning that linguistic forms bear; these are categorematic [kategorematische] or lexical meanings, deictic meanings, part-of-speech meanings, and syncategorematic meanings. These four meaning types yield three groups of parts of speech: a. main parts of speech (nouns, verbs, adjectives), which have lexical meaning and refer to entities, events and characteristics of external reality; b. words that contain meanings that do not refer to external reality, such as deictic forms, pronouns and pro-forms in general; c. words without lexical or deictic meaning and whose semantics obtains only in relation to other parts of speech. Particles are a subgroup of the last group; for Weydt & Hentschel, *particles are words without lexical or part of speech meaning* [Wörter ohne lexikalische und ohne Wortartenbedeutung].

Based on the above definition, Weydt and Hentschel try to delimit particles against similar words such as adverbs and interjections. According to the authors, predicative adjectives should not be classified as particles by virtue of their reference to characteristics existing in external reality as well as of their special distributional features. The same holds for deictic adverbs (*here, there*) or those ending in the equivalents to the English endings *-ly, -wise*, as well as other adverbs of manner. The behavior of adverbs reflects the variable nature of this word class, which ultimately makes it difficult to categorize them as a word class or as syncategorematic; thus, Weydt & Hentschel remark at the end of their paper that there are many border line cases where the assignment to one or the other class is difficult. Finally, the other words against which the term particle has to be defined and delimited are interjections, which Schachter (1985: 58) calls "words, often of exclamatory character, that can constitute utterances in themselves, and that usually have no syntactic connection to any other words that may occur with them". Weydt & Hentschel (1989) exclude them from the category of particles, "denn sie gehören ganz sicherlich nicht zu den synkategorematischen Wortarten". All of the three types of interjections identified by Weydt & Hentschel (those in comic strips, onomatopoeic, and emotional) are said by the authors to have direct reference to external reality.

1.2. Classification

Departing from the above definition of particles, Weydt and Hentschel (1989) propose the following classification:

1. Conjunctions: coordinating or subordinating; their function is to join sentences or parts of sentences.
2. Prepositions: establish relations and divide the sentence in parts; unite with nominals.
3. "Gradation particles": the authors use the term to refer to two types of particles (actually they suggest the term is inadequate).
 - 3.1. Intensive: modify a characteristic expressed by another word (an adjective in most cases) by either reinforcing or weakening it, e. g. Eng. *very*, Ger. *ziemlich*.
 - 3.2. Focus: build a common constituent with the element they modify, placing it under focus, e. g. Ger. *ausgerechnet*, Sp. *solo*.
4. Modal: express the degree of probability of an utterance (e. g. Eng. *maybe*, Ger. *vielleicht*. Due to their function of expressing probability, these appear basically in declarative sentences (impossible in commands, wishes, etc.)
5. Nuance (*Abtönung*): their scope is extraclausal; these function at the discourse level, ("sie kommentieren ihn [the sentence] als Gesamtäußerung von einer Metaebene aus und verankern ihn so im Redekontext"). These particles usually originate in deictic elements.
6. Answer and negation: these negate or affirm the state of affairs or parts of it.

The above classification shows basically two types of particles according to their meaning and function. Those in 1., 2., (some of 3.) and those in 6. can be termed *factual* because they merely fulfill functions that are syntactic in essence; conjunctions and prepositions, some intensive and focus particles simply fill a syntactic slot in a given string; what all these seem to have in common is that their scope, "the semantic counterpart of that part of a sentence that is relevant for spelling out that contribution" (König 1991: 31), is rather "local" – it does not go beyond their immediate environment; this is especially true of focus particles (cf. König 1989, 1991) –. On the other hand, those particles in 4., 5. and some of 3. show extraclausal scope and subjective use; these can be termed *subjective*. Thus, the meaning of subjective particles is context-dependent and their use is speaker-based.³ These particles can in turn be regarded as the grammaticalization of a discursive category which we can call ASSESSMENT. In the literature on particles emphasis has been placed on those termed here

subjective (focus, nuance, intensive, and modal). This has to do with the fact that these are the ones which create the greatest difficulty to the researcher in trying to account for their meaning and function in a uniform way. It is well-known that these forms show a range of meanings that a first glance seem disparate. The newly born Spanish particle *diay* is a case in point. Thus in the reminder of this section the discussion will center on the subjective particles.

1.3. Function of subjective particles

Subjective particles perform essentially a pragmatic function; this is both a cause and a consequence of their wide, sentential scope. For most authors the role of subjective particles is to express both knowledge of and attitudes (of the speaker) toward a proposition. Weydt calls them *Abtönungspartikeln* because they tinge utterances; they can express "mood of speech" [Gesprächsstimmung] when they refer to knowledge shared by the interlocutors. According to Abraham (1991 a: 333), subjective particles "make visible, by way of some specific illocutive force, what the speaker ... deems adequate to fully desambiguate a certain prior or following text or discourse portion"; this implies that subjective particles "signal gaps in the argumental configuration of a prior text and partly indicate how a missing argument is to be reconstructed by the hearer or reader". The corollary of this is that the occurrence of these forms, being syncategorematic but at the same time pragmatic markers, is dependent on sentential types and illocutive force (Abraham 1991 a). In addition, subjective particles also have a contact-preserving function, especially in informal situation: "Mit ihrer Hilfe signalisieren Sprechender und Antwortender, ohne auf explizite sprachliche Inhalte zurückgreifen zu müssen, einander ihr eigenes 'Rollenverständnis'" (Kirstein 1983: 217).⁴ Departing from the assumption that speaking creates situations while particle-speaking especially creates situations, Kirstein (1983: 217) remarks that "Es sind nun insbesondere partikelhaltige Äußerungen, die durch den impliziten Verweis auf gewisse 'situative Faktoren' wie Sprechereinstellung, gemeinsamer Wissensstand, eigenes/fremdes Rollenverständnis, etc. die Situation für den jeweiligen Zuhörer definieren (sollen)". Kirstein goes as far as to say that what defines a particle is the speech act; for this author it makes no sense to

3 From a general point of view language use is subjective; uttering sentences is in itself a subjective issue: the speaker is expressing his view of the world; however, from the point of view of the grammaticalization of attitudes, there are forms such as modal verbs, particles and mood markers whose primary function is to signal that aspect, as opposed to other (*realis*) forms, whose function is basically propositional (cf. Palmer 1986).

4 These particles also fulfill a phatic function: cf. *schönes Wetter heute* vs. *'s doch schönes Wetter heute*, where the second sentence requires more participation by the addressee (Kirstein 1983: 219). As we will see in 3., this is also the case with *diay*.

speak of the primary meaning of particles, or of whether a particle has a general meaning determining all of its occurrences.⁵ Although it is true that context-dependence is a characteristic of particles it does not necessarily imply that a "general meaning" cannot be assigned to these forms. Foolen (1989) distinguishes three levels of meaning of particles: a. most abstract level with the general meaning of the lexical item (*Gesamtbedeutung*); b. intermediate level where the general meaning is also present but only for the particle use; c. a concrete semantic level where there is a specification of the semantics of the uses under the general meaning; this is practically a pragmatic level. This constitutes a methodologically sound procedure for both synchronic and diachronic description, since the three levels actually correspond to grammaticalization stages (see 2. and 3.).⁶ Similarly, Fábrićz (1989) highlights the relationship between particles and their sources (usually conjunctions, adverbs, or deictic elements) and stresses the fact that "the meaning of a MP [modal particle] originates from the meaning of its etymon filtered through predication" (cf. also Abraham 1991 b); this characterization nicely summarizes the features of subjective particles; these are forms resulting from the grammaticalization of different types of word classes whose meanings contain the necessary material for generalization at the textual level; this semantic material includes such general concepts as addition, opposition, cause, result, etc.

1.4. Particles in Spanish

In the Spanish philological tradition the term *particle* is also used as a cover term including word-classes such as interjections, adverbs, conjunctions, etc. (see Martín Zorraquino 1992 for an extensive literature review). The main characteristics ascribed to particles so defined are their extracausal scope and their subjective, *modal* value; this is an implicit definition of particles as subjective particles (factual particles rarely whet the interest of grammarians). The early

5 The author does mention, however, that "Ausgeschlossen werden kann [...], daß die definitive Bedeutung einer Partikel in einer "Sprechsituation" ihrer "Gesamtbedeutung" in der Sprache entspricht, weil in *keiner* "Sprechsituation" das *ganze* Bedeutungspersonal einer sprachlichen Form *voll* [emphasis in original] zur Entfaltung kommen kann" (Kirstein 1983: 223).

6 Abraham (1991 b) calls these two approaches the *maximalist* and the *minimalist*; Kirstein's (and others') view that the meaning has to be sought in every single utterance where a particle appears (maximalist) is said by Abraham to fail to account for similarities (and/or differences) between context types, while the minimalist approach, by departing from one common meaning, can account for those similarities in terms of meaning derivations. As we will see in 2. and 3. the minimalist approach is the more accurate. It is simply in line with nature of grammaticalization.

grammarians of Modern Spanish, Salvá and Bello, spoke of *subjective gradation* of some particles, whereby they meant the coexistence of both meanings/functions, a "literal" and "subjective" with stages in between. This perception corresponds to what grammaticalization theory now regards as the *specialization* and the *subjectification* of a grammaticalized form; the former is the condensation of semantic nuances of the respective forms within a functional domain; the every time more restricted choice possibilities acquire more general grammatical meanings (Hopper 1991); the latter consists in a shift of meaning of the form undergoing grammaticalization, which becomes "more centered in the speaker's attitude to the situation" (Hopper & Traugott 1993). Since subjectification is not an exclusive feature of particles but, rather, constitutes an important ingredient of grammaticalization (a clear case being aspectual auxiliaries), it does not seem justified to subsume other parts of speech such as adverbs and conjunctions under the class of particles; in other words, subjectification alone does not suffice to regard a form as a particle – still this has remained common practice even well into the second half of the century –. As stated in 1.1., it is the syncategorematic status of these words that defines them as such; thus, it is both syncategorematic meaning and subjective meaning that make a subjective particle out of a form. This delimitation is crucial for characterizing a language, in this case Spanish, as one that makes use of this type of words and the grammatical categories these may encode. Thus, this delimitation readily precludes referring to Spanish as a particle-fond language as opposed to Dutch, German, Tzotzil, or Latin (see 4.).⁷

While Bello paid more attention to the subjective character of particles (however these were defined), Gili Gaya (*apud* Martín Zorraquino 1992) underscores the extraclausal scope of these forms as a manifestation of the textual function of coherence-maintenance, which is attained by means of coordination, negation, inference, and modality. The category is so widely defined, that adverbs, adverbial phrases, phraseologisms, and interjections are regarded as *particles* (as mentioned above, in some cases the lists are almost endless). The new term, *pragmatic connectors*, has emerged to deal with all these forms in Spanish philology; the common denominator is their extraclausal scope. Thus, Solano (1990: 7) justifies subsuming all sorts of parts of speech under that name on the grounds that they establish links between sentences: "Es obvio que un texto o discurso no es una secuencia casual o desordenada de oraciones relacionadas por el contenido. Hay dispositivos formales que señalan la naturaleza de esas relaciones. Esos enlaces o recursos de conexión pueden ser gramaticales (nexos), léxicos, o entonacionales en el caso del habla y tienen como función fundamental 'conectar' oraciones y secuencias de oraciones."

7 Martín Zorraquino (1992: 121) remarks that particles in Spanish are representative of diatopic, diastratic and diaphasic features; this very fact speaks against viewing them as an established category in Spanish, i. e. entrenched in its grammatical system.

This onomasiological procedure has the disadvantage of overlooking the formal status of linguistic items and their role in the overall grammatical system of the language. In addition, "connection" is much of a cover term for functions in as much as particle is for forms, not to mention that some subjective particles in particular functions do not connect anything but merely express assessment about a proposition. The exact function and the grammaticalized notions these forms stand for is thus obscured.

2. Grammaticalization

According to Heine et al. (1991 a: 2) "Where a lexical unit or structure assumes a grammatical function or where a grammatical unit assumes a more grammatical function, we are dealing with grammaticalization, a process that [...] may involve any kind of grammatical function"; similarly Hopper & Traugott (1993: 4) state, "when a content word assumes the grammatical characteristics of a function word, the form is said to be 'grammaticalized'", and feature the fact that not only words but also entire constructions undergo grammaticalization. This process is slow and gradual and this fact manifests itself in instances of synchronic variation; that is, what sometimes appears as polysemy is nothing but the coexistence of two forms, one of which represents a grammaticalized version of the other, as in Spanish *frente*, which is both a noun ('forehead') and a preposition ('across'); as a noun it can be pluralized, pronominalized, or function as the nucleus of any noun phrase and as such undergo such syntactic processes as passivization, relativization, etc., while as a preposition it cannot. When a given item or construction grammaticalizes it can replace another form used to express an existing grammatical category in the language (for instance the go-future in the Romance languages, replacing the synthetic one), or it can introduce a new category into the inventory of grammatical categories of that language (as did the grammaticalization of the periphrasis *esse* + past participle in Latin, giving rise to a passive voice which supplanted the former middle voice). Grammaticalization is thus a diachronic process that shapes the grammatical component of a language by recruiting existing elements (forms) for new and/or old functions.

As for the forms that can undergo grammaticalization, Traugott & Heine (1991: 7) ascertain that "for any given grammatical domain, there is only a restrictive set of lexical fields, and within them only a restrictive set of lexical items, that are likely to be sources". So, for example, case markers originate from words that refer to body parts or from movement verbs, tense and aspect markers from spatial concepts, etc. What seems to be characteristic for these *source concepts* is that they offer concrete points of reference for human orientation and thus allow speakers to understand less concrete concepts (Heine

et al. 1991 b: 152). In this, both metaphor and metonymy play an essential role; both induce the progression from a cognitive domain to the next (Heine et al. 1991 b: 160 f.). In Heine et al. (1991 a: 72) metaphor and metonymy are characterized as (divergent) "components" of grammaticalization; the former involves "a transfer from one conceptual domain, which includes sense A, to another domain, which includes B, where the former domain is more abstract than the latter"; metonymy, on the other hand, drives the process from one stage to the next, "it reflects a process whereby a given context invites a specific conceptual interpretation, which is concrete in stage I, either concrete or abstract in stage II, and abstract in stage III". This progression, which is semantic in essence, is morphosyntactically and syntactically achieved by reanalysis and analogy (cf. Hopper & Traugott 1993).⁸

Equally important are the causes underlying the process. Operative in the grammaticalization process is the principle of 'exploitation of old means for novel functions', whereby "concrete concepts are employed in order to understand, explain, or describe less concrete phenomena. In this way, clearly delineated and/or clearly structured entities are recruited to conceptualize less clearly delineated or structured entities, and nonphysical experience is understood in terms of physical experience, time in terms of space, cause in terms of time, or abstract relations in terms of physical processes or spatial relations" (Heine et al. 1991 a: 28). These conceptualizations correspond to what Heine et al. (1991 b: 157) term *categorical metaphors*, some of which are SPACE IS AN OBJECT, TIME IS SPACE, "where the first category forms the topic and the second the vehicle within a metaphorical equation". We can thus conclude that grammaticalization is a gradual process, triggered by needs arising in discourse, which basically helps to express concepts and relations for which none of the existing forms in the repertoire of grammatical categories of a language is suited and, by means of identifying common features between a given form and the notion in need of expression, establishes a link that in most cases ends up in the creation of a grammatical category with its corresponding marker.

Two paths, referred to as "the lexical item > morpheme model" and "the discourse > morphosyntax perspective" by Traugott & Heine (1991: 2 ff.), have been identified through which grammaticalization proceeds. Heine et al. (1991 a) remark that rather than two paths or strategies these two ways represent approaches for studying grammaticalization. While it is true that the origin of grammaticalization can be found in discursive needs (the need to express new concepts through old means is after all discourse-triggered), it is no less so that there are also structural and typological causes determining what items grammaticalize for what purposes; for instance, in a language like German

8 However, Heine et al. (1991 a: 219) warn against equating grammaticalization with reanalysis, basically because a. the former is unidirectional while the latter is not, and b. former need not be accompanied by the latter.

which relies on adverbs for aspectual distinctions, verbs will not grammaticalize to aspectual auxiliaries as readily as in Spanish (cf. Lehmann 1990); although there may be discursive reasons behind the grammaticalization of verbs as aspectual auxiliaries in Spanish, it is also true that the choice of this word class for that function depends on the structural configuration of this language. Thus, there are cases of grammaticalization that are better captured by one or the other approach, and in this respect it makes sense to maintain the distinction, though keeping in mind that an integration of both is in principle the best account. The grammaticalization of *diay* (< *de ahí*) provides an example of both paths with a higher prominence of discourse-pragmatic factors, especially at the higher stages.

3. The birth of a particle

3.1. Background

Being as conspicuous as it is, *diay* has not escaped the attention of Costa Rican philologists. Already at the end of last century Gagini (1892/1975: 215) registers and censures it as a "vulgar" pronunciation of *y de ahí*; this remark is important obviously not because of its puristic view but because it shows that the particle was emerging at that time (Gagini registers *ydiay* and refers to it as "an expression"); so, the first step *de ahí* > *de ahí* with a change in stress had already taken place. Equally important is Gagini's explanation that it was used in questions meaning *¿qué pasó?* ('what happened?'); this means that it had acquired the meaning of temporal sequencer; the categorial metaphor TIME IS SPACE (Heine et al. 1991 a, b) was at work here: *y de ahí?* meant 'and from there (what was next)?', where there is no longer a location in space but in time (an event). This function of temporal sequencer led Arroyo (1971: 231) to categorize it as an adverb meaning *entonces* ('then'); Arroyo also lists *idiay* as an interjection but his example shows that it is not one, at least as defined by Schachter (cf. 1.1. above, "words that can constitute utterances in themselves, and that usually have no syntactic connection to any other words that may occur with them"). A look at Arroyo's (1971: 231) example of *idiay* as an interjection clearly shows that this is not the case (translation DQ):

- (1) *¿Idiay? el hombre se equivocó de casa*
[And then? The man went in the wrong house].

In (1) *idiay* behaves more like a rhetorical question than as an interjection; it serves to create the conditions to continue the narration (phatic function, see 3.3.).⁹

Recently, the particle has been mentioned in other descriptive works of Costa Rican Spanish. Solano (1990: 48) registers it as a "pragmatic connector" but falls short of explanations of its various discursive functions (perhaps as a side-effect of the methodological approach of viewing it as 'one more device to link sentences'). For Solano *diay* (notice that the initial /i/ is no longer part of the sequence; this is a clear case of phonological attrition) serves to introduce discourse (phatic function); the author mentions that when it appears in indirect discourse it means that "es importante para el hablante", but does not spell out that importance. Thus in (2) (Solano 1990: 49 [translation DQ]) there is no sign of importance; rather, the particle functions as a concessive (this function is termed *concurrency* below):

- (2) *Pero entonces yo dije, "Bueno. [sic] diay sí. Fulano se puede ganar cuarenta y cinco mil pesos al mes"*
 [But then I said, "Well. PART yes. F. can earn 45,000 pesos in a month"].

The concessive component of *diay* in (2) (and of the whole sequence) lies in the intonation; this is a 'fixed form' used in Costa Rican Spanish to express acceptance of points of view, situations, etc. Hence the remark ([sic]) about the transcription; in the spoken language there is no pause; *Bueno diay sí*.

Finally, Quesada Pacheco (1991: 101) classifies *diay* as an interjection whose meanings range from affirmation, question [?], admiration, and which is used "para indicar el deseo de que el emisor termine su discurso. También se usa para saludarse". Unfortunately, the author does not provide examples to show each of the functions he ascribes to it. In Quesada Pacheco (1995: 169) mention is made of the particle and one more (non-exemplified) function, *illative*, is attributed to it.

3.2. From adverbial to particle

In the following two sections the various uses of *diay* as attested in the corpus will be described and the various meanings will be analyzed from the perspective of continuing grammaticalization; the new functions fulfilled by the particle will accordingly be regarded as a evidence of the *function contiguity hypothesis* (cf. Heine et al. 1991 a: 154), which predicts that new functions acquired by a form

9 Arroyo's examples are taken from dialogues as created by costumbristic writers. The literary pieces analyzed by Arroyo were written between 1895 and 1965. (1) is from the novel *Mi madrina* by Carlos L. Fallas, written in 1952; this is important in regards to the chronology of the particle; it locates the phatic function of *diay* in the midtwentieth century.

which becomes "more grammaticalized" will form a unidirectional network of functions proceeding from more concrete to more abstract.

As has been pointed out, the source of *diay* is the adverbial phrase *de ahí*. In present-day (Costa Rican) Spanish *de ahí* coexists with *diay* (and variants); this coexistence is valuable because it permits to visualize the process of grammaticalization of the particle. *De ahí* appears as any other adverbial phrase in cases in which a spacial ablative relation is expressed. (3) illustrates this use:

- (3) *Di ahí me vine para 'ca a trabajar* (JM-C-2)
[From there I came here to work].

The next step in the advancing grammaticalization of the form is when this ablative relation shifts to the temporal dimension, as in (4):

- (4) *que jueraa en la mañana ... dos buses seguidos ... digámole que a las cinco y media, seis y media y después a siete ... de ahí hasta las doce ...* (FR-H-3)
[let's say in the morning ... two buses in a row ... let's say at five-thirty, six-thirty and then at seven ... from there until twelve].

In (4) the point of reference from which the relation emerges is wholly temporal, as evidenced by the context (times of the day). In some cases there is a dimensional overlap, so that it is difficult to assign the sentence an exclusively spacial or an exclusively temporal reading; this is the case in (5):

- (5) *uno le atiende primero cada cincuenta o tre/seis/si nu hay mucho estorbo y es llano, según 'ondee' onde sea, pone uno las visuales ... [unintel.] de ahí entoes el otro ... ponía así las filas, vedá* (JR-C-3)
[one looks carefully every fifty or three/six/whether there is not too much scum and whether it is flat, and depending on that one sticks in the landmarks ... [] from there then the next one ... would make the rows, you see].

In (5) there is a series of steps followed to build the railroad; in this case the sequence is both spacial and temporal: one does A at one point and after that point and time does B.

The common denominator of these cases (3–5) is the feature [SEQUENCE], inherent to ablative relations, that is, a separation implies a point of reference from which an entity (or an event) moves away; the relation is perceived as a sequence of two constituents in which the point of reference (A) functions as the first constituent and the second element (B) represents an indefinite goal of the movement. The "goals" may represent points in space, as in (3), in time as in (4), or both as in (5). In addition, the nature of the connection between A and B may

change from an external (from the point of view of the speaker) sequence in space-time to an internal sequence, i.e. one in the mind of the speaker, thus giving rise to more abstract *ablative* relations such as causality, among others. The TIME-TO-CAUSE categorial metaphor has been explained by Heine et al. (1991 b: 166f.) as follows, "Once the implication 'what happens earlier is the cause of what happens thereafter' becomes conventionalized the result is a shift from metaphorical category of TIME to one which is more 'abstract', like that of CAUSE." Interestingly, this new step of grammaticalization occurred via interrogative contexts. Gagini's remark that the form corresponds to *what/why happened?* shows both that the coalescence had already taken place and that it served to express interrogative causality. This usage is of special importance because it gave way to a whole series of meanings/functions of the particle, as will become clear in 3.3., below. This use is not attested in the corpus. Arroyo (1971: 231 [translation DQ]) found it in Gagini's contemporary, González (whose works were produced between 1895–1934), in that function:

- (6) -¿Bien, pero *idiay*?
 -¿*Idiay* qué? ¿Pos no ve que jue por ber *ispiao* la mama el *clis* de sol por lo que son *canelas*?
 [Well, but then/why?
 Then/why what? Don't you see that it was because their mother saw the solar eclipse that their hair is cinnamon-colored?].

(6) Comes from a story called "El *clis* de sol" ('The Solar Eclipse'). It is about a woman who cheats on her husband; she becomes pregnant from her blond lover and gives birth to twins with cinnamon-colored hair. In order to camouflage the evidence of the affair, the lover invents the explanation that the twins' hair color was the result of the mother's seeing a solar eclipse when she was pregnant and the cheated husband buys the explanation. In (6) the husband is explaining to the author of the story (M. González) why the twins' hair is cinnamon-colored (being both parents black-haired, González inquires about this unexpected situation). The function of *idiay* in the question is to inquire about the cause of a state of affairs, that is, it means 'why'; in the answer it expresses the state of affairs (the color of the speaker's daughters' hair) resulting from a cause (the girls' mother's seeing a solar eclipse).

The (ablative) relation remains constant through the whole set of functions of *diay*; it behaves as the "frame" on which new "applications" (semantic relations) are built. The causative function of the erstwhile adverbial phrase marks the transition from adverb to particle both in form and meaning; in the former, there is a reduction in form (stress placement *de ahí* > *di ahí* first and then increasing bondedness of the forms to an eventual coalescence *diay*), while in the latter the distance between the two constituents of the ablative relation also decreases (it can no longer be "measured" quantitatively in spacial or temporal distance, but

simply expresses a sequence, 'because of A then B'). The step temporal > causal sequence marks the borderline between the "concrete" uses of the form and the less concrete ones, matched by phonological attrition; this is why there are no cases of the source functioning as a marker of causality. For this function the more grammaticalized form, *(i)diay*, is used.¹⁰

The three steps just discussed occurred during the second half of last century, so that by the time of Gagini's description the form had already got to the point where it expressed causality. In Quesada Pacheco (1987) a collection of colonial manuscripts covering the period from 1562 to 1818 in Costa Rica is provided and there are no cases of the adverbial phrase in its "concrete" (adverbial) uses, even less a particle. In Quesada Pacheco (1990), a study of Costa Rican colonial Spanish there is no mention of the adverbial phrase either (the author covered the same period). Considering the date of Gagini's work (1892) and the stage of grammaticalization attained by *ydiay* at that point (spacial > temporal > causal sequence), the beginning of the process can be located in the mid-nineteenth century.

3.3. Further grammaticalization

So far, three steps in the grammaticalization of *(i)diay* have been identified (spacial sequence, temporal sequence and causal sequence). At the turn of the century the causative particle acquired new (more abstract) functions which were matched by a segmental reduction of the form. As mentioned in the previous section, this new step of grammaticalization arose via interrogative contexts; this fact was determinant in its further development. After (interrogative) causality *diay*'s development was twofold; a path emerged out of the interrogative sense, giving rise to what I will call DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY and the non-interrogative sense gave way to another path which I will term the DOMAIN OF CERTAINTY. The difference in domains originates in the perspective from which the ablative relation is viewed; while in the DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY the movement away is viewed from A (the speaker places him/herself on A) giving rise to a set of uses such as scanning, "unassertive" opinions and

10 There is a reinforced version of the adverbial phrase, *de ahí que* ('from there it is' = 'that's why'), which is not attested in my corpus and of which Solano (1990: 167 [translation DQ]) found only three instances in a corpus as large as mine:

(i) *De ahí que, como tú lo dijistes, no es de extrañarnos que Costa Rica sea uno de los primeros países en el mundo en haber suprimido la pena de muerte*
[that's why, as you pointed out, it should not surprise us that CR was among the first countries in the world that abolished the death penalty].

Reinforcements of this sort occur when due to grammaticalization the form loses both semantic and phonological integrity (cf. Lehmann 1982).

insecurity in general, in the DOMAIN OF CERTAINTY the focus is placed, or better, the speaker places him/herself on B. In the former, B is unknown (that is why it is only natural that it originated in questions) and this fact determines the further development along the lines of the uncertain; in the latter, on the other hand, the speaker knows B and relates it to A; this creates a whole dimension of (con)sequence which ultimately leads to uses that imply certainty, such as inference, evidence, conclusion and "positive (secure) opinion". The two domains, then, correspond to two perspectives of a causal relation:

A caused B	{	posterior perspective, focus on unknown B > uncertainty (<i>what, why, etc.</i>) anterior perspective, focus on known A > certainty (<i>that's why, thus, etc.</i>)
------------	---	---

Both domains comprise various meanings/functions which at first sight might look disparate, but which become easy to explain in terms of this bifurcation. In both domains the ablative frame is still present, as will become clear in the remainder of this section. All cases of *diay* in today's speech fall into either of these two dimensions.

Let us begin with the DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY. An ablative relation emphasizes 'movement away from A'; the goal may or may not be expressed. In its concrete sense this relation refers to spacial movement, with increasing metaphorization the movement becomes temporal and in yet another stage of metaphorization the movement expresses cause; in all three the point of departure (reference) is known (movement away from A); what remains unexpressed is the endpoint of that movement. Transferred to the interrogative context, this situation of unknown end has the effect of inquiring about if/how/why/when/what has happened, the B of the ablative relation. In the case of the meaning 'why' the mechanism consists in inquiring the semantic space existing between the point of departure (the A of the ablative relation) and the occurred event, the B of the ablative relation, which happens to be given (this is why in the DOMAIN OF CERTAINTY it usually means 'that's why'; that is, in that domain, *diay* expresses the semantic space that is absent in the DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY. Precisely this is what the form is intended to inquire about when used in questions:

- (7) DQ: *¿y usted?*
¿qué?, yo me quedé hablando con la 'buelita en la casa
 DQ: *¿diay?, ¿pero él no sabía que usted estaba 'riba!*
sí (MS-A-1)
 [-and what about you?
 -what? I stayed in the house, talking to his grandma
 -PART? but didn't he know that you were there?
 -yes].

(7) stems from a context in which the informant is telling about a trip to her would-be-husband's house. She tells the interviewer that after her long trip to his house the man only saw her, greeted her and left till the next day; perplexed, the interviewer then utters the question with the particle.

Indirect discourse provides a productive setting for the use of uncertain *diay*. This type of use is very frequent in colloquial narrations.

- (8) *entó le dice Tulio "no, yo ya me tengo que ir" "¿por qué?", le dice... "es que van a operar a Yamileth" "¿diay, qué le pasó?" le dice "no, que para... no tener más familia" (YQ-SJ-2)*
 [then Tulio says 'well, I've got to get going' "why?", he says... "Yamileth is going to be operated" "PART, what happened?" he says "nothing; it's to have no more children].

The so called "phatic function" (Solano 1990) of *diay* finds its natural explanation within this model; the fact that people normally greet each other with a simple *¿diay?* is nothing but a way to resume communication after a period of distance; *diay* inquires about the interval from the last encounter to the present one; this function is not present in the corpus because there was no casual encounter with the speakers. In all these three functions ((causative) direct question, phatic, and indirect discourse – which is an instance of phatic) the role of *diay* is to inquire about something, (B) in the ablative frame, occurring after and because of something else (A). It is interesting to note that the phatic function occurs in both domains; in both it has a resuming character, but while in the DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY it consists in resuming through inquiry from one speech partner to the other, that is, to resume contact between speech partners, in the DOMAIN OF CERTAINTY it consists in resuming through resumption (see below (28–31)), that is, to resume the subject.

Another function of *diay* in the DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY consists in the act of "scanning". This is a further development from the interrogative sense whereby the questioning no longer takes place between two participants but rather takes place in the mind of the speaker when s/he is going to say something in an "approximative" way. This use usually occurs when the speaker is asked a question and prepares to answer it:

- (9) *DQ: Y con quinientos soles ¿qué se hacía?*
-¡ah la puta! diay, te tirabas/te mandabas ¿qué 'ra? ... voy a ver si me acuerdo. Ahí una cerveza es, Victoria se llama, es un litrón, y van tres, piden un litrón y pá pá, los tres; ¿cuánto valí una cerveza? como quinientos soles, tal vez (VZ-SJ-3)
 [-And what could one buy with 500 soles?
 -Holy shit! PART, you could buy, what was it? ... let me try to remember.
 The beer there is Victoria, sold by the liter; three people order a liter and

bang bang, the three of them (drink it at once); how much was a beer? about 500 soles, I think].

- (10) *DQ: Y ¿quép/qué piensa la gente afuera de la universidad?*
 / / *Bueno diay, que habría ya que ponerse a ... a conversar un poco a fondo con la gente a ver qué piensa en sí de la ... de la universidad* (JM-C-2)
 [-what do people outside the university think (about this)?
 -/ / Well PART, one should ... talk a little deeply with people to see what they think about the ... the university].

While (9) shows the speaker scanning through his memory about the real value of 500 soles when he visited Peru, (10) provides a case of the speaker scanning through his repertoire of opinions or hearsay evidence to find something to give as an answer to the question asked; the example shows that he hesitates (notice the pauses, long //, and short ...) and finds nothing; his answer is rather vague and looks more like a restatement of the question that he was asked.

Scanning can become more dramatic, revealing overt insecurity. This use is very common in initiating a conversation, as in (11); or when the speaker feels that s/he is risking an opinion which may not be well-received, as in (12); for the purpose of justification, as in (13); or for admitted ignorance, as in (14):

- (11) *DQ: bueno, cuénteme la historia entoes cómo fue que dejó de venir diay, ¿cómo? ey, yo no sé, este, él dijo que diay ... pues, diy, [laughs] diay ... co/como termina todo* (MS-A-1)
 [-well, tell me the story, then, how he stopped visiting you
 -PART, what? PART, I don't know, uhh, he said that PART ... PART[pues], PART, [] PART ... as everything ends].
- (12) *en Costa Rica han cambiado mucho las cosas ... porque todavía aquí en Costa Rica, si nos comparamos ... a Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala y todo eso, esa gentes están como perros y gatos, verdá, y aquí en Costa Rica, pues diay, gracias a Dios que la gente somos un poco más ... no sé, más educados oo oo o más civilizados* (FR-H-3)
 [in Costa Rica things have changed a lot ... because still here in Costa Rica, if we compare ourselves ... to Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala and all that, those people behave like cats and dogs, you see, but here in Costa Rica, PART[pues] PART, thank God people are a little more ... I don't know, bettermannered or or or more civilized].
- (13) *diay, viendo yo el perrillo, diay, así tan [unintel.] diay [unintel.] viera como los chinean [unintel.] se lo llevó bien envuelto en una cobija* (JG-SJ-3)
 [PART, seeing that the poppy, PART, so [] PART, [] you should see how they pamper them [] she took it home in a blanket].

- (14) *Sister-in-law: bueno bueno, pero no es cierto que las ponía a todas a deschingarse*
diay yo no sé porqu' esos hace tiempo habían puesto un' acusación
 (YQ-SJ-2)
 [-well, but it is not true that he made them all take off their clothes
 -PART I don't know because those (people) had long lodged a complaint].

(11) takes place at the onset of the interview; the speaker was going to tell about her last (failed) marriage attempt (notice the reduced forms *ey* and *diy*, these will be dealt with below); it is interesting that the speaker does not really talk straight but beats around the bush to finally say "it ended as everything ends". The insecurity might have been due to the fact that the interview was just beginning or to the nature of the topic. In (12) the speaker seems to already know what he wants to say but feels a little shy of his pride about it, namely that Costa Ricans are more "civilized" than the rest of Central Americans (hence the 'I don't know' and the 'thank God'). In (13) the speaker is justifying why he gave away a poppy that his boss had given him as a present; the sequence of *diays* gives him both a sense of security and time to think about possible excuses; a purposively unintelligible portion of his speech helps him close the anguished situation by stating what ultimately happened to the poppy. Finally, in (14) the function of the particle is to prepare the hearer (her sister-in-law) to the acknowledgement of ignorance.

This concludes our review of the functions of *diay* in the DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY. The development of this domain can be represented as in (15). The shadowed functions mark the textual dimension (the extraclausal scope of *diay*), that is, the step to a speaker-based usage. The form is no longer used to refer to situations that occurred external to the speaker but to his own "uncertain" assessment of situations.

(15) **Metaphoric extension of an ablative relation I.**

SPACE >	TIME >	INTERROGATIVE CAUSALITY >
	PHATIC >	SCANNING >
(ind. disc., greeting		INSECURITY (beginning of conv. opinion, justification, ignorance).

Before going into the DOMAIN OF CERTAINTY, I will briefly refer to the reduced forms of *diay*. As predicted by grammaticalization theory, semantic generalization of a form that becomes grammaticalized is usually accompanied by phonological attrition. In the DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY *diay* exhibits a segmental reduction in its most abstract functions, scanning and insecurity. Reduced forms when scanning are *iay*, *diy*, *ey*. Examples of reduction are those form (16–21):

for scanning

- (16) DQ: *¿y usted qué interés cree que tienen los gringos en meter todo esto? // diy... yo digo que que queee... que mucha genteee... ha cambiado pero pero... pero aquí... el diez por ciento... del llamado diezmo... es/s/ustéee... a usted lo a usted le averiguan cuánto gana... (LS-H-1)*
 [-in your opinion, why are the gringos interested in bringing all this in here?
 -// PART... I think that that that... that many people... have changed but but... but here... 10 %... of the so called tithe... that's/you... they find out how much you earn].

Notice that despite the *yo digo* ('I think') this is a case of scanning, since there is actually no opinion expressed but rather, after hesitating (scanning), the speaker comes up with something which is neither an opinion nor an answer to the question he was asked.

- (17) DQ: *¿Y usted como trabajador como/qué en qué sentido, qué cambios ha notado entre 'l gobierno anterior y éste? // Bueno iay, tal vez cambios de de la políticas, de las políticas nacionales han repercutido en las políticas universitarias (JM-C-2)*
 [-and you as a worker how/what in what sense, what differences have you noticed between the previous government and the current one?
 -// well PART, maybe changes in in policies, the national policies have affected university policies];

for expressing a "unassertive" opinion

- (18) *porque los animales no se deben de maltratar, ellos son animales, porecitos... echar apuestas, ganar plata con... con animales... era como que lo apuesten a uno, váá... y sin embargo, ve usted esos que ahí boxean y todo eso, son... apostar, matasen ahí y esquijarasen la cara... porqui otro los vea peliando, diy, yo no estoy con eso (FR-H-3)*
 [because animals should not be hurt, they are animals, poor things... betting, making money through... through animals... that's as if one were betted, you see, and yet, you see those who box and all that, they're... betting, killing themselves, smashing their faces... so that others look at them when they fight, PART, I don't agree with that];
- (19) *y son carajadas, y unu tiene... ey, no, pero, diay, si uno es, veá, es eléctrico, veá, también (JG-SJ-3)*
 [those are attributes that one has... PART, no, but, PART, one is, you know, electric, you know, too];

for expressing "insecurity"

- (20) *¿por qué m' iba 'cer monja?... diy, no sé... primero entré al colegio, de noche... (MS-A-1)*

[why I was going to become a nun? ... PART, I don't know ... I first went to school, in the evenings ...];

for justifying

- (21) *yo conozco gente de, pongamos, de nivel social superaltu, nivel social nn medio, nivel social bajo, y yo he hablado con toda esa gente porque a mí me gusta mucho así, hablar con ey, y a veces much / "es que mi mamá, es que mi papá"* (MC-H-2)

[I know people of, let's say, a super high social level, middle social level, low social level, and I have talked to many of those people because I like that very much, to talk PART, and sometimes it's 'well my mom, my dad'].

Since scanning is in a way also a matter of insecurity, and there is reduction of the *diay*, and since there are no shortened forms for the non-subjectified forms (in interrogative causality there is no **diy?* or **ey?*), it is possible to generalize that the greater the uncertainty the shorter the forms. It is also important to note that it is easy to come across large portions of text in which the speakers recover security either because they are telling a story they know or are speaking about "their specialty" and there are no instances of the particle. This confirms *diay*'s function as signaling uncertainty.

I now turn to the DOMAIN OF CERTAINTY. As pointed out above, this domain emerged out of the non-interrogative sense of causality; the earlier "movement relation" between A and B was reinterpreted as 'A caused B'. The DOMAIN OF CERTAINTY arose out of the "anterior perspective" of that relation; being A known the speaker, s/he relates it to B and this results in "known causality". Thus, it is not uncommon to find *diay* expressing the causes of some state of affairs; (22) illustrates this, albeit in indirect speech (the first *diay* belongs in the DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY):

- (22) *como por ejemplo ahí está y ... cuand' uno menos pensó tiró todo ... y Marta Eugenia "yo no sé" ... "diay, ¿qué pasó aquí?" "diay, que Marcela se puso, yo no sé porqué"* (YQ-SJ-2)

[for example, she's there and ... the minute you least expected, she threw everything away ... and Marta Eugenia (says) "I don't know" ... "PART what happened here?" "PART, that Marcela got (mad) I don't know why].

That Marta Eugenia does not know the cause why Marcela got mad does not mean that Marta Eugenia does not know what happened, which is what the mother's question is about. In this sense Marta Eugenia's *diay* is certain ('what happened?' 'She got mad').

Causality leads to results; *diay* has also acquired the function of expressing results. This has been possible via a reinterpretation of 'A causes B' as 'B results

from A'. Since CAUSE and RESULT are contiguous states of affairs/categories, this step is clearly anticipated by the function contiguity hypothesis:

- (23) // buenooo... *mmparece que Keith & Ramírez amenazó con eso... verdá, entonces, diay, nootro esperábamos el momento ese* (FR-H-3)
 [// well... I I think that Keith & Ramírez threatened with that... you know, thus PART, we were expecting that moment].

A function closely related (contiguous) to that of result is the expression proof or obviousness as in (24) and (25):

- (24) *Este Costa Rica, que antes los gringos decían que se venían a Costa Rica porque aquí... era muy lindo, pero ahora yo creo que lo los turistas le van a tener miedo a venirse a vi/a a Costa Rica... porque, diay, volcanes... tenemos má/estamos rodeados de volcanes, por todo lado* (MS-A-2)
 [I mean, Costa Rica, the gringos used to come to Costa Rica because here... it was very nice, but now I think that tourists will be afraid of coming here... because, PART, volcanoes... we have/we are surrounded by volcanoes all over].
- (25) *no no; yo me acuerdo bien d'eso porque diay yo ya estaba grande cuando eso* (VZ-SJ-3)
 [no no; I remember that well because PART I was a grown-up by then].

These examples provide the reason (proof) of the speaker's judgements.

Just as in the DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY, there is also a phatic function fulfilled by *diay* in the DOMAIN OF CERTAINTY, which serves to resume the discourse topic:

- (26) *DQ: pagaban muy mal, dicen*
ah, cualquier verga, pero diay la gente quería trabajar, veá, y aquí siempre la mano di obr' ha sido regalada... Diay, eso ahí en Panamá por eso es quee en el canal la mayor parte son negros, veá (VZ-SJ-3)
 [-the pay was very bad, they say
 -ah, whatever shit, but PART people wanted to work, you know, and here hand labor has always been cheap... PART, there in Panama that is why in the Canal Zone most people are black, you know].

The first *diay* in (26) is inferential (as explained below); it is the second instance of the particle that illustrates the function of topic-resuming. The previous text was about the black workers brought to Central America from Jamaica; the speaker lists the places they were brought to, one of them being the Canal Zone; the interviewer then makes the comment about the low pay, and the speaker resumes the topic by means of the particle. The same occurs in (27):

- (27) *pues sí; mi mamá y esas gentes pasaron penurias, y las ponían a trabajar como como como... más qui un hombre porque hoy trabaja más una mujer casi que un hombre... y y yy ellas... diay, casi todas murieron jóvenes... de tanto maltrato: sembrar café* (MS-A-2)
 [well yes; my mother and those people went through hardships, and they were made work like like... more than men because nowadays a woman works more than a man... and and aand they... PART almost all of them died at a young age... from so much hard work: planting coffee].

In (27) the topic "the hardships of women in the past" is interrupted by the comment about male laziness; *diay* permits the speaker to resume the topic after a slight loss of line. It is important to remark that the phatic function in the DOMAIN OF CERTAINTY does not proceed in the interaction between two speech participants but rather in the speech of one single individual; this means that the phatic function in this domain is more grammaticalized (high subjectification) than in the DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY, and, secondly, that this type of phatic function constitutes the bridge between less speaker-based uses of the form. This duality is illustrated by (28), where the phatic use of *diay* is still rather "external" (less speaker-based) but at the same time shows a high degree of involvement by the speaker in the line of the narration:

- (28) *y les lavó el coco, veá, y les afianzó toda l' harina... y les puso todo tan fácil, nada más de "ya trabajamos"... diay, así que les afianzó l' harina les ya, a la Interpol, al FBI, "aquí tengo aquellos hijueputas!"* (VZ-SJ-3)
 [and he brain-washed them, you know, and took away all their money... and made them believe everything would be as easy as "all we need is work"... PART as soon as he took away their money he just called Interpol and FBI, "hey, I've got those sons of a bitch here!"].

I will refer to this type of phatic function as *resumptive*; it permits to connect the narrated text/sequence of events by using the particle in a rather rhetorical way. This use of the particle in narrated speech is extremely prolific. Notice that unlike the cases in (26) and (27) there is no digression from which to go back to the topic; rather, the resumptive function is rhetorically topic-resuming.

The uses of the particle previously discussed are rather speaker-external. This means that the use of *diay* shows a low degree of speaker involvement in the situation; in Hopper & Traugott's (1993) terms there is a low degree of subjectification. As subjectification advances, however, there obtains a shift of meaning of the form undergoing grammaticalization, which becomes "more centered in the speaker's attitude to the situation". This means that the state of affairs represented becomes more a matter of opinion than a simple 'objective' description of a situation. As a result, new, more abstract functions emerge in the DOMAIN OF CERTAINTY; one of these is to express inference:

- (29) *trajeron negros, chinos, italianos... nada más*
DQ: ¿el italiano se devolvió?
no no, se murieron muchos ahí; diay, la/los ee los que se casaron con tías de Zeneida... en Paraíso dos de esos italianos se casaron con tías de Zeneida... (JR-C-3)
 [-they brought blacks, Chinese, Italians... that was all
 -and the Italians went back (to Italy)?
 -no, no, many died there; PART, the the uh those who married Zeneida's aunts... in Paraíso two of those Italians married aunts of Zeneida's].
- The inference is that 'if some Italians married Zeneida's aunts, it must have been the case that they did not go back'.
- (30) *DQ: ¿cómo pasó a ser escritor?*
diay... eso e e'eso de Calufa fue pura intuición d' él... porque ya le advierto quee Calufa era ee e/yo nunca le conocí trabajo ni nada (ES-A-3)
 [-how was it that he became a writer?
 -PART... that uh uh uuh well Calufa, it was mere intuition... because, I'm telling you, Calufa was uuh u/I never knew that he had a job or anything].

In (30) it is the case that Calufa became a writer "intuitively" (that is, with no formal training) because he had no job; the inference, at least for ES-A-3, is that to become a writer one needs to have a job or some training. The difference between 'proof' and inferential functions of *diay* roughly lies in that in the former the cause is more explicitly present in the text while in the latter a link has to be established between the pieces of information available.

After the point where the earlier ablative relation has become inference via causality and proof, judgements introduced by *diay* become plain opinions. I have detected three types of those more speaker-based functions; one of them is to express concurrence:

- (31) *Pepe se los trajo y ahí les dio asilo, veé: "Ahora usted se va a llamar aquí así y asá, con este nuevo posaporte, pá pá, todo eso se hace ahí, vedá"*
DQ: el mismo timo
diay sí (VZ-SJ-3)
 [-Pepe brought them and gave them asylum, you see: "Now your name will be this, with this new passport, bang bang!, this is done like this, you know"
 -the same old trick
 -PART yes].

This function need not refer to the contents of the speech act as in the previous example. There are cases in which the speaker is actually referring to beliefs or myths that s/he concurs with; *diay* expresses that concurrence:

- (32) *pero... en ese caso, mejor lo que hacía Cortés: allá en Itiquís había una loquilla... y diario la cargaban... entons en una de descargue... la operó... ya la liberó; eso no es pecado, por ¿cómo hacer? si di un viejo y di otro viejo y [all at the same time] ella ni sabía, ella era demente... pero bonitilla y, diay, los hombres como son así (MS-A-2)*
 [but... in that case what Cortés did is better: there in Itiquís there was a madwoman... and they would constantly knock her up (lit. "load her")... then once as the "unloading" session came... he operated on her... he liberated her; that's not a sin, for what can you do? she didn't have a clue who had done it [] she didn't know, she was nuts... but a looker, and PART, men are like that].

Concurrence can become reinforcement:

- (33) *Mirá, esos hijueputas eran tan reladrones... tan reladrones qu' esos hijueputas... ee... se acostaban pensando, me imagino, a ver a quién le robaban algo al otro día... esos jueputas, vedá, 'ta más sucious diay sí (VZ-SJ-3)*
 [Look, those sons of a bitch were such fucking thieves... such fucking thieves that those sons of a bitch... uh... would go to bed thinking, I imagine, about who they would steal something from the next day... those sons of a bitch, you know, complete assholes PART yes].

Finally, *diay* serves to express a "pure" (assertive) opinion, as opposed to "shy" opinion in the DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY:

- (34) *DQ: ¿y Sofia qué decía? toda contenta*
aah doña Sofis u... sí Sofia sí le gustaba mucho, pero... pero diay somos diablitos, ninguno estamos llamados para eso por lo visto [laughs] (MS-A-1)
 [-and what did Sofia say? she was happy
 -oh doña Sofis ha... oh yes Sofia liked the idea very much but... but PART we are little devils, none of us has been called for that apparently[]].
- (35) *si cualquiera pegara un golpe como cualquiera lo pega, bien pegado, cualquierap tuviera la mano multada, pero, diay, un golpe hay que saberlo pegar (FR-H-3)*
 [if anyone gave a blow as anyone does, well knocked, anyone would have this hand fined, but PART one has to know how to give a blow].

The development of the functions in the DOMAIN OF CERTAINTY is summarized in (36); as in (15), the shadowed functions mark the textual dimension, where the

use of *diay* becomes more speaker-based usage. The form is used express "certain" assessment of situations. The fact that many functions of *diay* seem to overlap is precisely an indicator that they are contiguous.

(36) **Metaphoric extension of an ablative relation II.**

SPACE > TIME > CAUSALITY > RESULT > PROOF >
PHATIC > INFERENCE > OPINION
(resumptive)
(obviousness, concurrence, assertive opinion)

In the DOMAIN OF CERTAINTY there is also a reduction of the forms (phonological attrition) accompanying the more grammaticalized functions; here too, it is possible to generalize that the greater the certainty the shorter the forms. Certainty increases as we move from left to right; the functions to the right are more speaker-based and as such the speaker does not need external information for his/her assessment, it is his/her sole choice to express an opinion or to concur with someone. Thus the case of *diay* confirms the generalization, already made by Hopper & Traugott (1993) that the more speaker-based a grammaticalized form is, the more reduced its formal integrity is. Although result and proof are still speaker-external functions, there are already reduced variants of *diay* for these functions. The following examples illustrate each of the functions as expressed by the reduced forms. While the phatic function, which is speaker-based to the extent that it requires the speaker's assessment as to where there is a change of topic and (how) to resume it, shows no reduced form in the DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY, it does show reduction in the DOMAIN OF CERTAINTY; a possible explanation for this could be that in the latter the context of use of the particle is the interaction of two speakers plus the fact that the form is used precisely in encounters: the "full form" seems more appropriate. Reduced forms are found for result:

- (37) *ahora están en pleito por eso porque pasaron unos volantes diciendo que sacaran todo lo qu' eran carajadas 'onde tenían mucho chunche y todo eso para pasar a botalon; mandaban un doming' unas vagonetas... diy, ahora resulta que todo mundo sacó... y diay... y ahí se quedó eso (FR-H-3)* [they're fighting now because they circulated some fliers asking people to take out all sorts of dregs and trash to be thrown away; (they said) they'd send a pick-up truck on Sunday PART now everybody took out... and PART... everything is there];

(37) shows two instances of the particle expressing result; the first is reduced, the second is not;

proof

- (38) *están enbus/investigando a ver si es un tigre que se come los perros... [unitel.] no han vuelto a entrar porque se come se come 'se perro, no le deja ni/diy esos perros valen carísimos... (JG-SJ-3)*
 [they're investigating to see if it is a tiger that's eating the dogs... [] they haven't gone back to the mountain because it eats it eats that dog, it doesn't even leave/PART those dogs are awfully expensive];

the importance of the search for the tiger is evident from the fact that the dogs devoured are extremely expensive; put differently, the price of the dogs justifies the search for the tiger;

phatic

- (39) *ahí lo encontraron, ahí lo dejaron, "no hay tiempo", eso jueputas son locos porque son unos hijueputas, vedá // Y yay... 'pareció el hijueputa ahí muerto, veá (VZ-SJ-3)*
 [there they found him, there they left him, "there's no time", those sons of a bitch are crazy because they're such sons of a bitch, you know // and PART... the son of a bitch was found dead there, you see];

inference

- (40) *DQ: ¿eran extranjeros o eran ticos?*
diy, tienen que ser extranjeros... porque yo la verdá no los conoci (FR-H-3)
 [-were they foreigners or Costa Ricans?
 -PART, they must be foreigners... because, actually I didn't meet them];

opinion (obviousness)

- (41) *DQ: ¿y a usted le gusta más ese que el otro?*
Aunt: ¡diy! de viaje se ve que solo ese quiere, de viaje! (MS-A-1)
 [-and do you like this one better than the other?
 -PART! it's obvious that he's the one she loves, obvious!]

concurrence

- (42) *lo que pasa es qu'entoes cuando, claro que sí, ya cuando dieron el plesbiscito, ey de lógico tenían que dárselo a a favor de l' Hacienda (JM-C-2)*
 [the thing is that when, of course, when they called the referendum, PART logically the Ranch was going to be favored];

this is a sort of "forced concurrence"; the speaker is talking about a confrontation between the landowner and his workers and how in a referendum he "logically" has to win; in other words, he concurs with the fact that "the master always wins";

pure opinion

(43) *'ntoes ahí anduvimos en los periódicos, por la televisión y toda la cosa, iay más bien era bonito* (JM-C-2)

[then we appeared in the newspapers, on television and everything, PART actually it was nice].

3.4. Summary

The analysis has shown that the grammaticalization of *diay* out of an ablative relation obtained initially from the TIME IS SPACE categorial metaphor, followed by a reinterpretation of the ablative relation in terms of causation (TIME-TO-CAUSE). At that point there was a split caused by the use of the particle in questions to inquire about the cause of something and by the "normal" use of causality (in declarative sentences). Two domains emerged as a result of this split and the functions within each of those domains represents a further degree of abstraction which is accompanied by segmental erosion of the sign. As grammaticalization advanced, the scope of the particle widened and this caused a shift from the sentential to the textual context and ultimately to the level of daily life, world views and experience in general. In all meanings/functions of this particle, however, an "ablative frame" can be reconstructed which contains SEQUENCE as its semantic core and which becomes lexically impoverished but pragmatically rich. (44) illustrates the grammaticalization of *diay*.

(44) The grammaticalization of the particle *diay* (< *de ahí*)

STATUS OF RELATION	FACTUAL (speaker-external)	>	ASSESSMENT (speaker-based)
SCOPE	clausal	>	extraclausal (textual, real world)
METAPHORIC EXTENSION/FUNCTIONS			
(uncertainty)	SPACE > TIME > CAUSALITY	{greeting, ind. disc.}	{shy opinion, justification ignorance}
		> PHATIC > SCANNING > INSECURITY	
(certainty)	> RESULT > PROOF	> PHATIC > INFERENCE > OPINION	
		{resumptive}	{obviousness, concurrence, assertive opinion}
CHRONOLOGY 1850	1900	1950	2000

The shadowed area in (44) represents the discourse-pragmatically determined functions; this step represents the point where semantic impoverishment

becomes pragmatic enrichment. The analyses has shown that an approach to particle meanings based on every single meaning of the form involved misses important generalizations, i.e. the patterns of meaning shifts due to discursive strategies; this is why Weydt & Hentschel (1983) suggest that the polysemic approach misses the point of the basic feature of the forms involved, in our case the metaphorization of an ablative relation, and propose in every case to reconstruct the pragmatic mechanism that gives rise to the various contextual options (see also Abraham 1991 b). Lastly, the path followed by *diay* is in line with that followed by German subjective particles, as described by Abraham (1991 a: 373), namely:

LOCALISTIC > TEMPORAL > LOGICAL > ILLOCUTIVE/DISCOURSE FUNCTIONAL, thus giving external evidence to the analysis presented in this section. This discourse-pragmatically triggered development constitutes a case of what Bybee (*apud* Abraham 1991 a) has referred to as *pragmagrams* (= pragmatic morphemes).

4. Typological implications

I will conclude by alluding to the implications of the process described in the body of the paper. Language typology implies a. generalizations about language, obtained through comparison; b. characterization of structures as variations of a single (semantic) domain; and c. generalizations about language structure in terms of implications (e.g. 'if a language is SOV the it is likely to have postpositions'). I will briefly refer to the implications of the grammaticalization of *diay* in these terms. In the first place, it should be noted that the fact that a new form has been recruited and added to the inventory of the poorly represented part of speech (subjective) *particle* in Spanish does not alter the marginal status of that class; the geographic scope of *diay* is reduced and some of its most grammaticalized functions are likewise geographically reduced; casual observation of Nicaraguan (Managuan) speech reveals that the use of *diay* shows no domain bifurcation yet; its use has only reached the interrogative causality/phatic stage in what here has been recognized as the DOMAIN OF UNCERTAINTY. This diatopic limitation, characteristic of other particles from other varieties of Spanish, leaves this language with a very limited number of general, standard, particles such as *pues*, *claro*, *bueno*. Actually, this limitation is concomitant with two other characteristics of the few Spanish subjective particles, which evidence their marginal character, namely their generational fluctuation and their diastratic determination (Martín Zorraquino 1992: 122). In a true particle-language such as German there are cases of "minimal pairs of particles", e.g. where the (pragmatic) meaning of an utterance changes depending on the particle used, as in the following examples:

- (a) *Du kannst mal das Fenster schließen*
- (b) *Du kannst ja das Fenster schließen*
- (c) *Du kannst doch das Fenster schließen*
'You can close the door'

(a) is a weak command, (b) expresses advice, and (c) is a case of advice without consent to a wish of the interlocutor (Kirsten 1983: 216). This speaks against viewing Spanish as a particle-language; in German such cases are part of all registers and lectal variations. This is a sign of a higher "structural integration" of these elements in German as opposed to Spanish, where only a few appear in the written language fulfilling a text-assessing function.

Secondly, although the grammaticalization of *diay* suggests the grammaticalization of the discursive category ASSESSMENT in (Costa Rican) Spanish, it would be somewhat hasty to speak of ASSESSMENT as a separate category of this language; more in line with its behavior in the overall grammatical system of this language would be to regard this "movement toward structure" as a development within the semantic-functional domain of modality. In other words, the grammaticalization of *diay* constitutes a reinforcement of a semantic domain which in Spanish still relies on a cohesive mood system (e. g. many of the more grammaticalized functions of *diay* can be expressed by means of the conditional) for the most part as well as on a wide variety of lexical expressions (phraseology).

Finally, in close connection with the observation made in the preceding paragraph is the relation between the existence of a category such as ASSESSMENT (with its corresponding markers) and other areas of the structure of a language. In this respect, this paper does not go beyond what hitherto has been said about this relation, namely that the existence of subjective particles seems to revolve around the notion of mood. The correlation between the existence of a productive set of subjective particles and the organization of word order in terms of a middle field, as presented in Abraham (1991 b) has been questioned by König (1991: 173), and at present no satisfactory account of a possible structural correlation has been offered nor will be offered here. This is not a shortcoming of the paper but a limitation of its scope.

References

- Abraham, Werner (1991 a): *The grammaticization of German modal particles*. In Traugott & Heine (eds.) 1991: 331–380.
- (1991 b) *Discourse particles in German: How does their illocutive force come about?* In Abraham, Werner (ed.) *Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam. Benjamins: 203–252.
- Arroyo, Victor M. (1971): *El habla popular en la literatura costarricense*. Publicaciones de la Universidad de Costa Rica.

- Akkedal, John O. (1989): *Sprachtypologische Aspekte norwegischer Partikelstrukturen*. In Weydt (ed.): 691–702.
- Brody, Jill (1987): *Particles borrowed from Spanish as discourse markers in Mayan languages*. *Anthropological Linguistics* 29 (4): 507–21.
- Dalmas, Martine (1989): *Sprechakte vergleichen: ein Beitrag zur deutsch-französischen Partikelforschung*. In Weydt (ed.): 228–239.
- Foolen, Ad. (1989): *Beschreibung für Partikelbedeutungen*. In Weydt (ed.): 305–317.
- Gagini, Carlos. (1892/1975): *Diccionario de costarrriqueñismos*. San José. Editorial Costa Rica.
- Heine, Bernd et al. (1991a): *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago University Press.
- Heine, Bernd et al. (1991b): *From cognition to Grammar – Evidence from African Languages*. In Traugott/Heine (eds.) 1991: 149–187.
- Herring, Susan (1991): *The Grammaticalization of rhetorical questions in Tamil*. In Traugott/Heine (eds.): 253–284.
- Hopper, Paul J. (1991): *On Some Principles of Grammaticization*. In Traugott/Heine (eds.): 17–35.
- Hopper, Paul/Thompson, Sandra (1984): *The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar*. *Language* 60: 703–752.
- Hopper, Paul/Traugott, Elizabeth (1993): *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kirstein, B. (1983): *Partikeln und Sprechsituation*. In Weydt (ed.): 213–225.
- König, Ekkehard (1989): *On the historical development of focus particles*. In Weydt (ed.): 318–329.
- (1991): *The Meaning of Focus Particles: A Comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Kroon, Caroline (1995): *Discourse particles in Latin: A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and ut*. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.
- Lehmann, Christian (1982): *Thoughts on Grammaticalization. A pragmatic sketch*. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität (Akup 48).
- (1985): *Grammaticalization: Synchronic Variation and Diachronic Change*. *Lingua e Stile/a*. 20, 3: 303–318.
- (1989): *Grammatikalisierung und Lexikalisierung*. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 1: 11–19.
- (1990): *Towards lexical typology*. In: Croft, William et al. (eds.) *Studies in Typology and Diachrony*. Amsterdam: Benjamins; 161–183.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek. (1991a): *On the Gradualness of Grammaticalization*. In Traugott/Heine (eds.) 1991: 17–35.
- (1991b): *Semantic Change and Heterosemy in Grammaticalization*. *Language* 67: 475–509.
- Martin Zorraquino, M. Antonia (1992): *Spanisch: Partikelforschung/Partículas y modalidad*. *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik Vol VI* (1): 110–124.
- Quesada Pacheco, Miguel A. (1987): *Fuentes documentales para el estudio del español de Costa Rica*. San José: Alma Mater.
- (1990): *El español colonial de Costa Rica*. Editorial de la Universidad de Costa Rica.
- (1991): *Nuevo diccionario de costarrriqueñismos*. Cartago: Editorial Tecnológica.
- (1995): *Diccionario histórico del español de Costa Rica*. San José. EUNED.
- Schachter, Paul (1985): *Parts-of-speech Systems*. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.). *Language typology and syntactic description*. Cambridge University Press. Vol. 1: 3–61.
- Solano, Yamilet (1990): *Los nexos en el habla culta costarricense*. UNAM (Mexico). Diss.
- Traugott, Elizabeth/Heine, Bernd (eds.) (1991): *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. 2 Vols. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Traugott, Elizabeth/König, Ekkehard (1991): *The Semantics-Pragmatics of Grammaticalization Revisited*. In Traugott/Heine (eds.): 189–218.
- Weydt, Harald (ed.) (1983): *Partikeln und Interaktion*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- (ed.) (1989): *Sprechen mit Partikeln*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Weydt, Harald/Hentschel, Elke (1983): *Der pragmatische Mechanismus*. In Weydt (ed.): 263–273.
- (1989): *Wortartenprobleme bei Partikeln*. In Weydt (ed.): 3–18.

Eingereicht am: 29. 4. 1996.

Angenommen am: 17. 2. 1997.