PATTERNS OF GRAMMATICALIZATION IN ENGLISH

Boryana Bratanova
University of Veliko Turnovo

PATTERNS OF GRAMMATICALIZATION IN ENGLISH

Boryana Bratanova
St. Cyril and St. Methodius University of Veliko Tarnovo

> „*Today's morphology is yesterday's syntax.*"
> (Givón 1971: 413)

Grammaticalization has to do with the gradual process of semantic bleaching when the referential meaning of a lexeme weakens and its grammatical function ultimately takes over. It is a complex linguistic phenomenon, which dwells in the area of language change with focus on semantics and morphosyntax. The spiral of grammaticalization absorbs mainly lexemes with vaguer lexical meaning turning them into units of grammar. The paper highlights the fact that grammaticalization underlies a number of units in English, which are to be found at various stages up the spiral.

Key words: grammaticalization, stages of grammaticalization, patterns of grammaticalization, synthetic, analytic

1. Introduction

The present research paper aims at exploring aspects of the complex, universal and unidirectional process of language development and change, whereby the referential meaning of a lexeme weakens and its grammatical function ultimately takes over. The two major linguistic phenomena, which relate to such type of gradual language change, are known to be *semantic bleaching* and resulting *grammaticalization*. They operate within the same temporal plane and affect both semantics and morphosyntax. The spiral of

grammaticalization[1] absorbs mainly lexemes with vaguer lexical meaning turning them into units of grammar. The paper is based on the assumption that as far as English is concerned, lexical origin can be traced back with some morphological markers as well as with auxiliary verbs and semi-auxiliaries in case of complex constructions. The analysis outlines some major patterns of grammaticalization in present-day English. It highlights cases of grammaticalization by referring to instances of zero morphological marking, assimilation of morphemes within the lexeme, cases of affixation, phrasal verbs, auxiliation, and fixed constructions. The tentative hypothesis raised in the paper is that grammaticalization underlies a number of units in English, which are to be found at various stages up the spiral. As a means of producing items of grammar, both cases of fully grammaticalized units and cases of units located along the path of grammaticalization can be found in English. Thus, grammaticalization cannot be considered a homogeneous phenomenon and as such it should be studied as a continuum,[2] which at any time demonstrates stages in the gradual transition from a lexical item to an item of grammar. Finally the paper draws some major conclusions concerning the level of grammaticalization of present-day English.

2. The Theory of Grammaticalization

In the last twenty years there has been a marked interest in grammaticalization mainly in typological perspective. The theory of grammaticalization has been consistently developed by a number of linguists, most notably Bybee (2002, 2011), Fischer (2011), Fischer and Rosenbach (2000), Haspelmath (2004), Heine and Kuteva (2002, 2007), Heine and Narrog (2010), Hopper and Traugott (2003), Lehmann (2002a, b), Wischer (2000, 2006) etc. In order to study grammaticalization, one has to apply a diachronic approach both to cases of fully grammaticalized units such as the *shte* future marker in Bulgarian as well as to cases of grammaticalized units, where the lexical meaning is still traceable, such as the *will* future marker in English. Grammaticalization is a complex

---

[1] In the paper the term *spiral* (Meillet 1912, Pencheva 2006: 411) is used to designate the change of language units from lexical to grammatical ones. The choice of the term *spiral* over the more commonly used term *cycle* is motivated by the inherent dissimilarities between any two stages in that transition. Though the process is in itself cyclic, in view of the time span, the notion of *spiral* seems to be more appropriate here.

[2] For the notion of *continuum* in relation to grammaticalization see Hopper and Traugott (2003: 6).

linguistic phenomenon which takes lexical units as input and provides grammatical units as output. In the course of time such units become void of any lexical meaning and acquire mainly grammatical function.

Grammaticalization is closely related to syntheticity vs. analyticity distinction in language. It is generally considered that as far as grammar is concerned, the development from synthetic to analytic language demonstrates how units have actually reached the end of grammaticalization cline. In such cases an affix or inflection is reduced to zero and is ultimately lost. When this happens, the process would probably start from the beginning with the use of lexemes for the lost categories of grammar, i.e. a new stage up the spiral has been reached. In other words, analytic (syntactic) units might ultimately result in synthetic (morphological) ones (see Givon 1971: 413, Lehmann 2002b: 12). Thus, synthetic vs. analytic would not be considered an opposition proper but can be interpreted in terms of different stages – an earlier stage of grammaticalization for analyticity and a follow-up stage of grammaticalization for syntheticity. English is a highly analytic language, which has lost the explicit morphological marking of a number of categories both with the verb and the noun. So for some grammatical categories the end of the grammaticalization cline has already been reached in the history of English. As a result, present-day English does not have a variety of nominal and verbal inflections, both of which can hardly be considered productive. Analyticity then is a way of compensating for the lost synthetic way of expressing grammatical categories, especially within the class of the verb. The loss of nominal categories has triggered the compensatory mechanism of fixed word order to denote grammatical relations. Actually, the fact that present-day English is a highly analytic language can be accounted for with reference to the process of grammaticalization. The change from synthetic language to analytic language means that a new stage up the spiral has been reached. In view of the above it can be claimed that from a diachronic perspective grammaticalization can be considered a mechanism, which triggers transition from analyticity to syntheticity and analyticity again thus initiating a new stage.

The study of the various patterns of grammaticalization in English below is based on two related definitions of that universal linguistic phenomenon. The first one is provided by Hopper and Traugott who define grammaticalization as "the change whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions and, once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions" (2003: xv). The second definition is provided by Wischer who defines

grammaticalization as "a process by which linguistic elements … change into constituents of grammar, or by which grammatical items become more grammatical in time. Examples are the development of auxiliaries from lexical verbs, or prepositions from nouns; the development of inflections from free adpositions; and the change of word-orders that signal pragmatic meanings, like theme or rheme, into grammatical word-orders that signal the syntactic cases of subject and object" (2006: 129). The paper highlights aspects of English morphology and syntax resulting from the process of grammaticalization and naturally points to lexical resources, which have acquired grammatical functions in the history of the language.

The process of grammaticalization is considered to be universal, unidirectional, gradual and nonreversible. Once grammaticalized, it is hardly possible for a language unit to gain back its lexical status. Wisher (2006: 129) highlights the fact that "linguistic items historically go through the following stages":

(1) free lexical unit > function word > affix > zero

Another similar grammaticalization cline is (ibid., 133):

(2) lexeme > function word > clitic > inflection > zero

Wischer (2006: 130) points two major types of grammaticalization, which are relevant to the present study – the functionalization of lexemes and cliticization / affixation. In both clines above semantic bleaching is observed when the lexical meaning of a notional word weakens and it acquires the status of a function word. Such a change is invariably due to increased frequency of use. The clines provided by Wischer will be employed to study the stages of grammaticalization in present-day English with the following addition. **Three major stages of grammaticalization are further elaborated based on Wischer's clines shown in (1) and (2) above.** Grammaticalization stage one refers to initial cases of grammaticalization when a lexical item turns into a function word. Grammaticalization stage two is continuation of the process and refers to cases when a function word is further grammaticalized and becomes an affix, clitic or inflection. Grammaticalization stage three refers to ultimate instances of grammaticalization when an affix or inflection is dropped out. Once the end of the cline is reached, a new cycle might be initiated.

The adoption of three stages of grammaticalization makes it possible to discuss that linguistic phenomenon as a continuum and locate various linguistic units along the cline of grammaticalization. Such an approach might also account for borderline cases which exist in any language. Moreover, the approach can be applied to contrastive analysis research in order to define the levels of grammaticalization of different languages as

well as the particular domain within which grammaticalization operates. The structure of the analysis in the paper follows the three stages of grammaticalization outlined above starting from stage three where the process is completed to stage two and stage one where the process is still in progress. It is assumed that cases of grammaticalization stage one are easiest to classify. Their lexical meaning is still traceable but the linguistic units can no longer function on their own due to their predominant grammatical function. Such instances are considered to be cases of prototypical grammaticalization. Thus the analysis below initially focuses on the highly grammaticalized morphological system of English and then highlights major cases of grammaticalization at the level of syntax.

3. The Morphological Pattern of Grammaticalization in English

➢ **Zero** – these are cases of grammaticalization stage three, most clearly represented by the loss of Old English inflections and case endings and resulting transition from synthetic to analytic language. The zero marking of a number of grammatical categories accounts for the high level of grammaticalization of present-day English. Within the class of the noun there are only scarce remnants of gender and case and there is no agreement between the adjective and the noun within the noun phrase. The verbal lexeme has largely lost its affixes with aspectual meaning, with the possible exception of the suffix *-en* (*length<u>en</u>*, *strength<u>en</u>*, *wid<u>en</u>*), which marks perfective (see Danchev 1974). The poor morphological marking of verbal tenses plus the structural ways of marking future and subjunctive also indicate a higher level of grammaticalization in present-day English. The smaller number of inflections has triggered the compensatory mechanism of word order. To compensate for its lost case system, the English language has developed fixed S – V – O word order, which actually encodes the salience of the participants in the extralinguistic situation. English also exhibits a number of fixed constructions to be discussed within the syntactic pattern of grammaticalization below. As a whole, the higher degree of grammaticalization of English morphology results in fixed constructions and fixed sentence structure. The identity of form between parts of speech should also be highlighted, such as noun and verb (*a book – to book*), adjective and adverb (*fast* (adj.) – *fast* (adv.)), function word, noun and verb (*But me no buts*), as well as the formal identity between transitive and intransitive verbs, between accusative and dative pronouns, etc.

➢ **Affixes assimilated within the lexeme** – these are affixes, which have become void of meaning and function. They are assimilated within

the lexeme, which synchronically is largely considered to be a single unit. In English there are pairs of lexemes such as *aboard – on board*, *amidst – midst*, *arise – rise*, *arouse – rouse*, *astray – stray*, *awaken – waken*, etc. The structural difference between these lexemes has to do with an affix, lacking in the second member of each pair. Due to the fact that the prefix *a-* is no longer productive, most of the lexemes which contain this prefix show limited usage at present. To name a few other cases[3]:

Present-day lexeme	Morphemic structure
alive, asleep, abroad	from Old English *an* (on) forming adjectives and adverbs from nouns
beguile	it has ME origin and was segmented into the prefix *be-* (thoroughly) and root *guile* (deceive)
behave	it has late ME origin and was segmented into the prefix *be-* (thoroughly) and root *have* meaning have or bear (oneself) in a particular way
ceiling	it is a verbal noun of ME origin from *ceil* meaning to overlay, to roof (a room), from OF *ciel* – sky, from L *caelum* – sky
forbid	it is of OE origin from *for* (against) + *beodan* (to command)
lightning	it is of ME origin, verbal noun extended form of O.E. *lihting*
mathematics, physics, thanks	*-s* used to be a plural marker

Table 1. *Assimilation of affixes*

The lexemes in Table 1 demonstrate affixes no longer interpreted as such in present-day English. In the history of the language these affixes have lost meaning and merged within the lexemic boundaries. Here belong also lexemes marked for plural by means of the *-en* ending (*children*, *brethren*, *oxen*), which is no longer functional as a marker of plurality.

➢ **Affixation** – it demonstrates cases of grammaticalization stage two. There are fewer cases of affixes in present-day English and very few of them are active and productive nowadays. Affixes in English can be subdivided in two groups – affixes of native origin and affixes of Latin origin, borrowed in English mostly via French. Both groups are represented in Table 2 below. It contains 21 affixes out of which 11 demonstrate native origin and 10 are of Latin origin. Borrowed affixes of

---

[3] Unless otherwise stated, the etymology provided in the paper is derived from *Oxford Dictionary of English*, 2010, Partridge, E. *Origins. A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*, 2006 and www.etymonline.com.

foreign origin are taken into consideration only in cases when they have proved productive in English attaching to native roots to produce lexemes. As shown in Table 2, such affixes (mostly prefixes) are *-able, co-, ex-, inter-, intra-, multi-, non-, post-, pre-, sub-*. To the group of affixes also belong the adjectival suffix *-ly* (*brotherly*) and the adverbial suffix *-ly* (*selfishly*), which ultimately go back to OE *līc* meaning *body, corpse*. At present the suffix *-ly* functions only as adjectival or adverbial marker without meaning of its own. Grammaticalization can be traced with both native and borrowed affixes. However, the process is more transparent with native, rather than with foreign affixes, as seen in Table 2[4]:

Present-day affix	Path of Grammaticalization
-able, -ible	ME, OF, L *-abilis, -ibilis* capable of, fit for; from L *habilis* apt, fit (*lovable*)
be-	ME, OE *be-, bi-*; akin to OE *bī* by, near – on, around, over (*besmear*) – make, cause to be, treat as (*belittle, benumb, befriend*)
co-	ME, Fr L *com-* from *com*, archaic form of classical L *cum* together with – with, together, joint, shared (*coexist, cooperate*)
-dom	ME, OE *-dōm* akin to OS *-dōm*, OHG *-tuom*, ON *-dōmr*, all from a prehistoric noun represented by OE *dōm* judgment – realm, jurisdiction, kingdom (*Christendom*) – state, condition (*freedom, martyrdom*)
ex-	ME, OF, L, *ex* out of, from – out of, away from (*exhale, exclude, export*) – former (*ex-president*)
fore-	ME *for-, fore-*, OE *fore-*, from *fore*, adv. – at an earlier point in time, beforehand (*foresee, foretell*)
-ful	ME, OE, from *full*, adj. – full of, characterized by (*bashful, eventful, peaceful*)
-hood	ME *-hod, -hode*, OE *-hād*, OHG *-heit* all from a prehistoric Gmc word represented by OE *hād* person, rank, state, condition – state, condition, quality, character (*boyhood, falsehood, brotherhood*)
inter-	ME *inter-, entre-, enter-* ME inter-, MF, L, *inter* – between, among (*intercommunication, international, interdepartmental*)
intra-	L *intra* – within

---

[4] The affixes presented in Table 2 are derived from *A Dictionary of Prefixes, Suffixes, and Combining Forms* (2002) and *Oxford Dictionary of English* (2010).

	– within (*intra-European, intramural*)
-less	adj suffix ME *-les, -lesse*, OE *-lēas*, from *lēas* devoid, false – destitute of, not having (*doubtless, countless, ceaseless*)
multi-	ME, MF, L *multus* much, many – many, multiple, much (*multidimensional, multilevel, multimillionaire*)
non-	prefix ME, MF, L *non* not – not, reverse of, absence of (*nonacademic, nonconformity, nonproductive*)
out-	ME *out*, adv. in a manner that goes beyond, surpasses, or excels (*outfight, outperform, outrun*)
over-	ME, OE *ofer* (over) – excessively, completely (*overambitious, overcareful, overjoyed*) – upper, outer, extra (*overcoat, overtime*, overcharge)
post-	ME, L *post* after, behind – after, subsequent, later, behind (*postcolonial, postwar, postposition*)
pre-	ME, OF, L *prae-, prae* before – earlier than, prior to, before (*predispose, prehistoric, prejudge*)
self-	combining form ME, OE *self-, seolf-, sylf-*, from *self, seolf, sylf*, pron. and adj. – oneself (*self-asserting, self-confident, self-made*)
-ship	ME *-schipe, -shipe, -ship*, OE *-scipe*; from a prehistoric Gmc word represented by OHG *scaf* nature, condition, quality; akin to OE *sceppan, scyppan* to shape – state, condition, quality (*friendship, scholarship, fellowship*)
sub-	ME, L *sub* under, close to – under, subordinate, secondary (*subculture, subdivision, subclass*)
under-	ME, OE *under*, from P.Gmc. *under- from PIE *ndhero - lower – below, beneath (*undercover, underground*) – insufficiently, incompletely (*undercharge, undercook*)

Table 2. *Grammaticalization of affixes*

All affixes (prefixes and suffixes) listed in Table 2 above have originated from lexemes, which in the historical development of the English language have lost their referential meaning. With some affixes the connection with the source word is more transparent than with others, cf. *-ful, -less, self-* vs. *be-, -hood, -ship*, etc.

➢ **Phrasal verbs** – their morphemic structure in present-day English is also the result of grammaticalization. They developed mostly in the ME period out of OE prefixed verbs. This process was largely triggered by the change in word order from O–V in the OE period to V–O in ME as well as

by the necessity to compensate for the Aktionsart distinctions expressed by OE prefixes. As a result, some of the remaining verbal prefixes moved after the verb and became post-positioned adverbial particles (see Akimoto 1999, Fischer 2008: 62, Lamont 2005). Brinton (1988: 217) points out the following changes with OE prefixes in the formation of ME phrasal verbs:

Forms lost: *ā- be-, for-, ge-, tō-*

Forms remaining: *of- > off, ofer- > over, forð- > forth, þurh- > through*

Forms added: *away < on weg* (on way), *down < of dūne* (from a height), *out <ūt, ūte, ūtan* (out, forth, away), *up < up, uppe, uppan* (up, away), *along < andlang* (on length, along)

In the history of English some of the OE prefixes have been abandoned, others have been kept after the verb and given rise to phrasal verbs. Newly formed particles, derived from former lexemes, have also contributed to the variety of phrasal verbs in English. The post-positioned verbal particles in English have largely grammatical function as aspect and Aktionsart markers. Some particles are mostly grammaticalized, ex. *about, across, along, around, off, on, round* while others, denoting mainly directions, have preserved to some extent their original lexical meaning, ex. *ahead, away, back, behind, by, down, forward, in, out, over, through, under, up*. The particles in both groups have adverbial or prepositional counterparts in present-day English. As particles they cannot function on their own and form one lexical unit with the verb they relate to.

➢ **Articles** – both the definite article and the indefinite article in English demonstrate instances of grammaticalization. The indefinite article *a(n)* has developed out of the OE numeral *ān* (one). The definite article *the* has originated from OE *þe*, the masculine nominative form of the demonstrative pronoun. In both cases notional words have lost their lexical meaning and have given rise to function words.

4. The Syntactic Pattern of Grammaticalization in English

The syntactic pattern of grammaticalization in present-day English is easier to trace than the morphological pattern discussed above. Cases of grammaticalized units at the level of syntax usually demonstrate grammaticalization stage one when a lexical unit turns into a function word. As pointed out in Section 2 above, grammaticalization stage one is considered to be the prototype since the lexical origin of such grammaticalized units is clear. These are mostly cases of notional verbs with lexical meaning and corresponding auxiliary verbs, which have developed purely grammatical function.

➢ **Auxiliation** – it is considered to be the prototype of grammaticalization, best exemplified by primary auxiliaries. According to Kuteva (2001: 1), the term *auxiliation* was coined by Benveniste (1968) "to refer to the development of auxiliary verbs out of lexical verbs". Kuteva (ibid., 1-2) also points out that "the development of auxiliaries can be said to involve a morphosyntactic change whereby the lexical structure *verb – complement* turns into the grammatical structure *grammatical marker – main verb*". The process of forming auxiliaries in English is to be traced below with primary auxiliaries, causative auxiliaries, and auxiliaries / semi-auxiliaries with modal and aspectual meaning.

▪ **Primary auxiliaries** – these are the verbs *be, have* and *do*, which in present-day English function in parallel within the two structures listed above. In the source *verb – complement* structure the verbs *be, have* and *do* function as notional verbs. In the follow-up *grammatical marker – main verb* structure they function as auxiliaries, which form the negatives and questions of simple tense forms, progressive tense forms, perfect tense forms as well as passive voice. However, in all these cases the link with the source lexeme is traceable, i.e. within the grammatical structure the most general meaning of *be* as denoting state, of *have* as denoting possession and of *do* as denoting activity has been preserved to much lower extent. With primary auxiliaries the corresponding full verbs exhibit broad lexical meaning and higher frequency of use, which has further facilitated the auxiliation process.

▪ **Causative auxiliaries** – these are the auxiliary verbs *make, have, get,* and *let*, which mostly combine with an agentive noun and a full verb to form complex structures with the meaning of causation, for ex. *The teacher made the students read the novel, She had her secretary type the letter, I got him to wash the dishes, They let her leave early*. To this group also belongs the verb *cause*, which takes non-agentive nouns as well, for ex. *The heavy snowfall caused the roof to collapse*. Compared to primary auxiliaries above, causative auxiliaries have kept their lexical meaning to a higher degree within the complex causative construction. The latter can possibly be accounted for by the fact that analytic causatives in English are structured after the Latin syntactic pattern *Accusativus cum infinitivo*, within which the causative auxiliary, similarly to a transitive verb, requires a direct object and a full verb in its infinitive form. The similarity between causative auxiliaries and transitive verbs can be attributed to the causative construction itself, which is syntactically compressed and the subject of the main verb functions as an object to the causative auxiliary. The structure

have / get something done also exhibits a case of grammaticalization of causative auxiliaries in English.

As far as the grammaticalization of causative auxiliaries is concerned, two facts should be highlighted here. First, they have a corresponding full verb *make, have, get*, and *cause*. A possible exception here might be the auxiliary *let*, which corresponds with *let* as phrasal verb. However, MdE verb *let* goes back to OE *lætan* (leave behind, leave out), which means that grammaticalization has occurred earlier in the development of the lexeme. Second, even within the group of causative auxiliaries different degrees of grammaticalization can be traced out. Just like with primary auxiliaries, full verbs corresponding to causative auxiliaries have broad and rather vague lexical meaning. However, the causative auxiliary *make* is less grammaticalized compared with the auxiliaries *have* and *get*, which are largely desemantized and have kept the meaning of possession and change respectively to a lower degree.

▪ **Auxiliaries / semi-auxiliaries with modal and aspectual meaning** – these are grammatical markers, which have developed out of lexical resources as well. Key auxiliaries in this group are *will* and *shall* as markers of futurity and modality. The auxiliary verb *will* has developed out of the OE full verb *wyllan* meaning *wish*, *want*. The auxiliary verb *shall* has developed out of the OE full verb *sceal* meaning *owe*. So the structure *will + V$_{inf}$* originally denoted volition while the structure *shall + V$_{inf}$* originally denoted obligation. The modal auxiliary verb *ought to* developed out of the OE full verb *āhte,* past tense of *āgan* meaning *own*, *possess*, *owe*. The etymology of *will*, *shall* and *ought to* provides evidence of the grammaticalized status of modal auxiliaries denoting futurity and obligation. It also highlights the structural way of expressing futurity in present-day English.

Grammaticalization in English can also be traced with semi-auxiliaries, which denote various aspectual and temporal properties of the verbal activity. Such semi-auxiliaries are *be going to*, which corresponds to the full verb *go* denoting movement, *had better* and *have to*, which correlate with the full verb *have* denoting possession, *used to* denoting habitual past activity, *get to* denoting the beginning of an activity (*get to know*), *keep on*, *go on* denoting the continuation of the activity, *help* in *can't help doing something*, which denotes an activity on the point of completion, etc.

➢ **Cliticization** – clitics demonstrate a clear case of grammaticalization stage two. These are mostly function words, which attach formally to the preceding lexeme (*enclitics*) with the tendency to

develop into affixes. The latter is to be found with a number of contracted forms in present-day English. Such is the case of *not* in English, which gets contracted and attaches to the preceding verb, for ex. *isn't, aren't, haven't, hasn't, hadn't, don't, didn't, won't, wouldn't, can't, couldn't*, etc. The same goes for the shortened forms of the primary auxiliaries *be* and *have* as well as the modal auxiliaries *will* and *would,* which all attach to the preceding noun or pronoun, for ex. *'m* (*am*), *'s* (*is* or *has*), *'re* (*are*), *'ve* (*have*), *'d* (*had* or *would*), and *'ll* (*will*). The modal verb phrase *had better* and the expression *would rather*, are used nowadays mostly in their contracted forms *'d better* and *'d rather* respectively, thus showing a tendency to become clitics. Another instance of cliticization is exemplified by *let's* in present-day English where the pronominal form *us* is undergoing grammaticalization and is turning into a clitic. Due to its increased frequency of use, the cliticized *'s* in *let's* would most probably continue to develop along the cline of grammaticalization and become an affix.

➢ **Word Order** – the S – V – O word order of present-day English is considered to be grammaticalized due to the loss of grammatical categories (most notably the case system) and the poor morphological marking of grammatical relations within the sentence. As a result, grammatical relations are expressed mainly through word order. The fixed word order pattern in English requires an obligatory subject in the sentence. In a number of cases the subject position is filled by the pronoun *it* in impersonal and emphatic constructions or by the adverb *there* in existential constructions, for ex. *It is possible to meet the deadline, It's you I'm looking for*, *There is a restaurant across the street*, *There comes a day when you learn the truth*. Such sentences with introductory *it* and *there* point to the grammaticalized status of the latter. Apart from subject, empty *it* can also function as an object, for ex. *She found it exciting to attend the ceremony*. In all such cases both *it* and *there* are desemantized and have purely grammatical (syntactic) function.

5. Conclusion

The morphological and syntactic patterns of grammaticalization discussed in the paper highlight the diachronic diversity of that complex linguistic phenomenon. The analysis points to the conclusion that grammaticalization should be analyzed as a continuum whereby the syntactic pattern generally precedes the morphological one. As far as the grammaticalization of affixes is concerned, it is closely related to productiveness. The ones which are highly grammaticalized are less productive while those that are less grammaticalized have kept their lexical

meaning to a higher extent and are more productive in the process of word formation. The development of English phrasal verbs has also been located along the grammaticalization cline. Auxiliation demonstrates the syntactic pattern of grammaticalization. English auxiliaries (primary, causative, aspectual, modal) have largely developed out of full verbs with general and vague lexical meaning. A clear case of movement along the cline of grammaticalization in present-day English is demonstrated by clitics, which are closer to the next stage of becoming affixes. However, in the history of English some affixes and inflections have already reached the end of the cline and become zero. As a whole, present-day English exhibits features of a higher degree of grammaticalization and the various stages outlined in the paper exemplify instances of language change over time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akimoto 1999: Akimoto, M. Collocations and Idioms in Late Modern English. // L. Brinton and M. Akimoto (eds.). *Collocational and Idiomatic Aspects of Composite Predicates in the History of English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999, 207 – 239.

Benveniste 1968: Benveniste, É. Mutations of linguistic categories. // W. Lehmann and Y. Malkiel (eds.). *Directions for historical linguistics: A symposium*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968, 85 – 94.

Brinton 1988: Brinton, L. *The Development of English Aspectual Systems: Aspectualizers and Postverbal Particles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Bybee 2002: Bybee, J. Cognitive processes in grammaticalization. // M. Thomasello (ed.). *The New Psychology of Language,* vol. II. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc., 2002, 147 – 197.

Bybee 2011: Bybee, J. Usage-based Theory and Grammaticalization. // H. Narrog and B. Heine (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press, 2011, 69 – 79.

Danchev 1974: Danchev, A. A Slavonic / Bulgarian view of the aspectual meaning of the Modern English de-adjectival *-en* verbs. // *Linguistics* 127, 1974, 5 – 26.

Fischer 2008: Fischer, O. History of English Syntax. // H. Momma and M. Matto (eds.). *A Companion to the History of the English Language*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2008, 57 – 68.

Fischer 2011: Fischer, O. Grammaticalization as Analogically Driven Change. // H. Narrog and B. Heine (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press, 2011, 31 – 43.

Fischer and Rosenbach 2000: Fischer, O. and A. Rosenbach. Introduction. / / O. Fischer, A. Rosenbach and D. Stein (eds.). *Pathways of Change. Grammaticalization in English*. John Benjamins, 2000, 1 – 39.

Givón 1971. Givón, T. Historical syntax and synchronic morphology: an archeologist's filed trip. // *Papers from the seventh regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 7. 1971, 394 – 415.

Haspelmath 2004: Haspelmath, M. On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. // O. Fischer, M. Norde and H. Perridon (eds.). *Up and Down the Cline – The Nature of Grammaticalization*. John Benjamins, 2004, 17 – 45.

Heine and Kuteva 2002: Heine, B. and T. Kuteva. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Heine and Kuteva 2007: Heine, B. and T. Kuteva. *The Genesis of Grammar: A Reconstruction*. Oxford University Press, 2007.

Heine and Narrog 2010: Heine, B. and H. Narrog. Grammaticalization and Linguistic analysis. // B. Heine and H. Narrog (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*. Oxford University Press, 2010, 401 – 423.

Hopper and Traugott 2003: Hopper, P. and E. Traugott. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Kuteva 2001: Kuteva, T. *Auxiliation: An Enquiry into the Nature of Grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press, 2001.

Lamont 2005: Lamont, G. *The Historical Rise of the English Phrasal Verb*. 2005. <http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~cpercy/courses/6361lamont.html> (accessed 10 December 2012)

Lehmann 2002a: Lehmann, C. New reflections on grammaticalization and lexicalization. // I. Wischer and G. Diewald (eds.). *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. John Benjamins, 2002, 1 – 19.

Lehmann 2002b: Lehmann, C. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Erfurt, 2002.

Meillet 1912: Meillet, A. 1912. L'évolution des formes grammaticales. // *Scientia* 12, XXVI-6, 1912, 384 – 400.

Momma and Matto 2008: Momma, H. and M. Matto (eds.). *A Companion to the History of the English Language*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.

Pencheva 2006: Pencheva, M. *Ezikovi universalii i tipologia*. Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski", 2006.

Wischer 2000: Wischer, I. Grammaticalization versus lexicalization: '*Methinks*' there is some confusion. // O. Fischer, A. Rosenbach and D. Stein (eds.). *Pathways of Change. Grammaticalization in English*. John Benjamins, 2000, 355 – 371.

Wischer 2006: Wischer, I. Grammaticalization. // K. Brown (ed.). *Encyclopedia of language and Linguistics*. Elsevier, 2006, 129 – 136.

DICTIONARIES AND WEBSITES

A Dictionary of Prefixes, Suffixes, and Combining Forms. Merriam Webster, 2002.

Oxford Dictionary of English. Kindle Edition. 2010.

Partridge 2006: Partridge, E. *Origins. A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*. Routledge, 2006.

<http://www.etymonline.com> (accessed 10 December 2012)