## From movement verb to evaluative intensifier: The evolution of Spanish *vaya*

**Basic data.** Besides its main use as a form of the movement verb *ir* 'to go', the Spanish form *vaya* 'go' is found in several idiosyncratic constructions that have received much attention in the literature [1]–[4], as examples of change from a verbal form to a discourse marker, an intensifier or an interjection. In this communication, we analyze the rising of the evaluative construction formed with *vaya* plus an indefinite NP (all examples are extracted from the *Corpus Diacrónico del Español*, CORDE https://corpus.rae.es/cordenet.html):

- (1) a. Sí: con mi amo viene aquí; ¡mas vaya una peleona! [1630]
  - 'Yes: she comes with my master; yet, what a fighter!'
  - b. Tiene un huerto... **¡vaya un huerto!** Con sus árboles frutales, parras,... [1816–7] 'He owns an orchard... What an orchard! With fruit trees, vines,...
- [2], [4] suggest that this construction is simply a derivation from the interjectional use in (2), involving a change from a propositional modifier to a NP modifier:
- (2) **¡Vaya!** Sea como fuere; venga el bollo mantecada. [1545-1565] 'Wow! Whatever, let's have the lard cake.'

While we do agree that the construction in (2) does have a *pragmatic* role in the creation of (1), we will argue that it cannot explain the particular selection properties of *vaya*, so we will defend that its *syntactic* source is rather the presentational construction in (3), which is a desemantization of the original movement construction:

- (3) a. ALIRA Ea, vaya un baile. FELISTO ¿Cuál? ALIRA El canario. [1613]
  - 'ALIRA Come on, let's have a dance. FELISTO Which one? ALIRA The Canary one.
  - b. Ayala [...] que todos vean que tengo razón para lo que hago. Callejo. ¿Sí?, pues **vaya este argumento**. Es así que de regalos de boda...[1767]
    - 'Ayala [...] so everybody sees that I am right in what I am doing. Callejo Are you? so let's go with this argument. It is the case that wedding presents...'

Hence, our proposal integrates the interjectional use in (2) with the presentational construction in (3), which we hypothesize it gives rise to the evaluative construction exemplified in (1).

**Diachronic analysis.** The use of *vaya* as an improper interjection (2) is firstly attested in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, becomes more common in the 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries (138 and 305 cases, resp.), and boosts in the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> centuries (1095 and 929 cases, resp.). Therefore, it precedes and coexists with the presentational one (3), which appears in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, reaches its peak in the 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries (100 and 104 cases, resp.), and declines during the 19<sup>th</sup> (80 cases), and 20<sup>th</sup> (23 cases) centuries. Crucially, the evaluative use under study (1) is scarcely attested in the 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries (4 and 9 cases, resp.), but boosts in the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> centuries (447 and 459 cases, resp.). Hence, the rising of the evaluative use clearly correlates with the decline of the presentational use.

We can take, thus, 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries as the initial stage of the process, where the coexistence of the interjectional and presentational constructions creates the conditions for moving to a bridging context [5]-[6]. This paves the way for ambiguous cases, and subjectification [3],[7]: the presentational construction incorporates the speaker's attitude toward the situation denoted by the proposition.

- (4) a. y así, en vez de una flor, **vaya un consejo**. [1847] 'and so, instead of a flower, here it goes an advice'
  - b. –Hay riesgos, ¿pero qué importa? –¡Hay riesgos!, ¡**vaya un reproche**! [1854]
    - '-There are risks, but who cares? -There are risks! What a reproach!'

(4a) could be understood as evaluative, but the context favors the presentational reading, for a contrast is offered between a flower and some advice. In (4b), instead, the reaction of the speaker to the previous words

suggests a subjective standpoint, and an evaluative reading instead of a presentational one. Crucially, this bridging context and the subjectification it brings about is due to interposition of the interjectional use, and it is followed by decategorization [8]-[9] and reanalysis [10]-[11]: the original presentational verb in (5a) becomes an evaluative specifier in (5b).

(5) a. [vP [v' vaya [DP un cuento]]] (**presentational**) b. [DP vaya [DP un cuento]] (**evaluative**) 'Let's begin a story.' 'What a scam!'

Crucially, once this reanalysis takes place, the new construction enters into a different set of collocations. Whereas the presentational construction allowed for definite DPs (3b), but involved no bare nominals, the evaluative construction selects indefinite DPs (unlike other evaluative intensifiers *j\*Menudo/\*Qué un huerto!* 'What an orchard!'), and bare nominals (*jVaya huerto!* 'What an orchard!').

A synchronic analysis. In [12] a full articulation of the layers of speech acts in assertive clauses is postulated, by which a distinction is made between the layer encoding the kind of speech act (ActP), the layer encoding the public commitment of the speaker towards the asserted proposition (ComP), and the layer encoding private judgements of the speaker towards the same proposition (JP). Here we adapt this framework to the evaluative vaya+DP construction as a movement of the intensified DP to the specifier of JP, which is headed by the speaker-oriented operator J—:

(6) [ActP ! [ComP [JP vaya (un) jaleo [J° J–]S1 [TP...habéis montado vaya un jaleo...]]] 'What a mess you made!'

This structure is interpreted as involving the surprise/upset attitude of the speaker toward the propositional content denoted by TP, as far as the content in the specifier of JP is considered. The proposition may be expressed, as in (6) or it can be anaphoric to a discourse salient one (¡Vaya (un) jaleo! 'What a mess!'). Finally, the speech act operator '!' in the head of SAP marks the utterance as an exclamation.

**Further consequences**. Indirect empirical support for our analysis comes from the comparison with the kindred deverbal form *venga* 'came', which also has an interjectional (7) and a presentational use (8), but lacks a \**venga*+DP evaluative construction.

- (7) En cuanto se mueve un poco, me muero de dolor. No sé si debo fumar, pero **¡venga!** 'When it barely moves, I feel a deadly pain. I don't know whether I should smoke, but, come on! [1947]
- (8) —¡Vamos!, ¡no te enojes, Juan!, ¡**venga un trago**! —¡No quiero! [1854] '—Come on! Don't be mad, Juan! Have a drink! —I do not want!'

Crucially, the interjection meaning is still close to the original movement meaning of *venir* 'to come', so it encodes an invitation, or an agreement, to acting. Yet it lacks any private judgment by the speaker, for it is hearer-oriented (i.e. intersubjective [7]). Unsurprisingly, we lack a subjective evaluative use.

[1] S. Tanghe, "Acerca de los intensificadores *vaya* y *qué*: un estudio comparativo," *BHS*, 90(7), pp. 751–770, 2013. [2] Á. O. de Toledo, "¿ Un viaje de ida y vuelta?: La gramaticalización de "vaya" como marcador y cuantificador," *Anu. Filol.*, 11(11), pp. 47–72, 2001. [3] C. Company, "Subjectification of Verbs into Discourse Markers: Semantic-pragmatic Change only?," *Belgian J. Linguist.*, 20(1), pp. 97–121, Nov. 2007. [4] S. Tanghe, *Marcadores derivados de verbos de movimiento*, 2016. [5] B. Heine, "On the role of context in grammaticalization," in *New reflections on grammaticalization*, 2014, pp. 83–101. [6] G. Diewald, "A model for relevant types of contexts in grammaticalization," in *Typological Studies in Language*, 2002, pp. 103–120. [7] E. C. Traugott, "From subjectification to intersubjectification," in *Motives for Language Change*, 2003, pp. 124–140. [8] E. C. Traugott, "From propositional to textual and expressive meanings; some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization," in *Perspectives on historical linguistics*, 1982, p. 245. [9] H. Saito,

"Grammaticalization as decategorization," *J. Hist. Syntax*, 5, pp. 1–24, 2021. [10] I. Roberts and A. Roussou, *Syntactic change: A minimalist approach to grammaticalization*, 2003. [11] E. van Gelderen, "Features in reanalysis and grammaticalization," in *Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization*, 2010, pp. 129–147. [12] M. Krifka, "Layers of Assertive Clauses: Propositions, Judgements, Commitments, Acts," in *Propositionale Argumente im Sprachvergleich: Theorie und Empirie*, 2019, pp. 1–42.