

THE PHENOMENON OF AUXILIATION AS A PART OF GRAMMATICALIZATION IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Yunusova Hilola Ravshan kizi

Fergana State University, EFL Teacher

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7238494>

Abstract. This article discusses the phenomenon of auxiliation, which is considered to be one type of grammaticalization where lexical words change their nature and demonstrate grammatical functions. Auxiliation appears as a universal phenomenon and analyzed both in English and Uzbek languages.

Key words: auxiliation, grammaticalization, lexical functions, grammatical functions, auxiliary verbs, desemantization, decategorialization, cliticization.

ФЕНОМЕН АКСИЛЯЦИИ КАК ЭЛЕМЕНТ ГРАММАТИКАЛИЗАЦИИ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Аннотация. В данной статье рассматривается явление аксиляции, которое считается одним из видов грамматикализации, при котором лексические слова меняют свою природу и демонстрируют грамматические функции. Ауксиляция предстает как универсальное явление и анализируется как в английском, так и в узбекском языках.

Ключевые слова: ауксиляция, грамматикализация, лексические функции, грамматические функции, вспомогательные глаголы, десемантизация, декатегориализация, клитикизация.

INTRODUCTION

Strictly speaking, grammaticalization is referred to as a type of language change whereby grammatical items come into being: lexical words or constructions, in specific contexts, come to acquire grammatical functions, and once grammaticalized, can continue to develop new grammatical functions.

According to Newmeyer, grammaticalization is a complex phenomenon which comprises changes such as phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic modifications. It was Antoine Meillet who coined the term “grammaticalization” and first applied it to the concept for which it is still used today. Modern studies in grammaticalization began in the early 1970s with the work of Givon, who argued that in order to understand language structure one must know how it has evolved. With his slogan “Today’s morphology is yesterday’s syntax”, he opened a new perspective for understanding grammar.

But in this paper we will merely draw our attention to auxiliation as one of the main aspects of grammaticalization process as it is our primary concern.

Auxiliation is the process of development of auxiliary verbs out of lexical resources. This term was firstly coined by Benveniste.

Many researchers have been arguing on the universal character of the auxiliaries. Steele writes the followings: “To call AUX a universal category is not to argue that every language will choose it. But the overwhelming majority of languages in this particular language sample do; Southeastern Pomo is the one exception”. Abraham also lists the languages such as Latin, Greek, (early) Gothic, and Old High German among those without auxiliary verbs.

Basic to work on grammaticalization is the concept of a “clin”. From the point of view of change, forms do not shift abruptly from one category to another, but go through a series of small transitions, transitions that tend to be similar in type across languages.

METHOD AND METHODOLOGY

The characteristics of grammaticalization can be summarized by phonetic, morphosyntactic, and semantic properties as follows:

- desemantization: lexical verb loses most or all of its lexical semantics
- decategorialization: lexical verb loses salient morphosyntactic properties of a verb
- erosion: lexical verb tends to be phonetically reduced.

Warner lists four characteristics of auxiliaries which developed in the 16th or 17th centuries:

- a) cliticization (is - 's, will - 'll, etc.) except: ought, used, dare, need
- b) tag questions (... , isn't it?, etc.)
- c) exclusively VP complements except: “have” possess, “be”
- d) not reduced to suffix n't (isn't, etc.)

The famous possessive *have* is still an ordinary auxiliary for many speakers in the UK but it is exceptional in its valency (taking an object rather than a VP complement). This usage persists in most of the UK giving forms like the following:

1. They've a car.
2. Have they a car?
3. They haven't a car

In the Germanic languages, many modal verbs derive from Proto-Indo European preterite-presents, i.e. original full verbs whose inherited perfect form was used with stative present function. Among them are OE *can(n)* ‘know, be able’, *sceal* ‘owe’, *mæg* ‘be able’. These verbs developed a past tense inflection of their own, which made them morphologically highly irregular. Their syntax was still that of common verbs in Old English. During the Middle English period, however, they developed those syntactic peculiarities which make them constitute the syntactic category of modal verbs; and as such the verbs *can*, *shall*, *may* and others appear in the 16th century.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Historically “must” was a past –tense form and contrasted with present-tense “mot”, a tense contrast which survives in High German (*muss* “has to” vs. *musste* “had to”). Almost all Germanic modal verbs – for example English *can*, *may*, *shall* – go back to preterite present verbs, which had lost their potential to refer to past events in pre-Old English times. They had all special morphology, which became even more special over time, particularly in English, whose central modals constitute probably the most highly grammaticalized verb class in Germanic, if not the languages of the world.

Through grammaticalization, the historical past tense forms *must*, *might*, *would*, *could*, *should*, *ought (to)* also largely lost their potential to refer to past events in most context by late Modern English. The meaning of these modal verbs shifted from past-time marking to others, usually more abstract grammatical domains such as hypotheticality and irrealis (*would*, *should in conditional clauses*) or politeness (*would*, *could*). And those that still retain the possibility of referring to a past event are neither unusual and need contextual clues (Krug, 2011):

- I *could* (was able to) swim when I was a kid.
- We *would* often go for a swim when we were kids.

Here is a table with a list of modals that were used as lexical verbs in Old English.

Table 3

Infinitive	1 st /3 rd SG. PRES	Meaning	Present-day modal
<i>witan</i>	<i>wat</i>	'to know'	---
<i>dugan</i>	<i>deag</i>	'to be useful'	---
<i>cunnan</i>	<i>cann</i>	'understand, can'	<i>can/could</i>
<i>unnan</i>	<i>ann</i>	'to grant'	---
<i>þurfan</i>	<i>þearf</i>	'to need'	---
<i>durran</i>	<i>dearr</i>	'to dare'	<i>(dare)</i>
<i>sculan</i>	<i>sceal</i>	'should'	<i>shall, should</i>
<i>munan</i>	<i>man</i>	'to commemorate'	---
<i>magan</i>	<i>mæg</i>	'can'	<i>may, might</i>
<i>agan</i>	<i>ah</i>	'to possess, must'	<i>(ought)</i>
<i>motan</i>	<i>mot</i>	'must, can'	<i>must</i>

Auxiliary *do* is often called 'periphrastic' *do* because it has no meaning independent of the meaning of the construction concerned; the only reason for using auxiliary *do* in Modern English is because the syntax requires an auxiliary and no other auxiliary is needed by the sentence's meaning. *Do* fills the gaps where non-auxiliary verbs are not allowed and where other auxiliaries are not needed. In Middle English, in contrast, *Do* had no special role because auxiliary and non-auxiliary verbs could be used in much the same ways.

Table 4

Sentence-type	Old	New
Negative declarative	He went not.	He did not go.
Negative question	Went he not?	Didn't he go?
Positive question transitive	Saw he the dragon?	Did he see the dragon?
Pos. question intransitive	Went he?	Did he go?
Pos. wh-object question	What saw he?	What did he see?

Examples of the older grammatical form are still found in popular song, verse and even political speeches. For example, the children's ditty, *He loves me, he loves me not* demonstrates negation without do-support.

Theories concerning the emergence of do-support are too numerous to list in their entirety. The prototypical theory asserts that, periphrastic do evolved out of *causative do*, from the West Germanic root, *don* and before that from the Proto-Indo-European root, *dhe*, which means to put, place, do or make.

Hudson makes the following conclusions about the appearing of auxiliary "do" which are, to our belief, could be applied to "have" and "be" as well:

- a) Auxiliary *do* is introduced, allowing the option of using an auxiliary without changing the meaning.

- b) Adverb-preposing make subject-verb inversion awkward for verbs modified by adverbs, so auxiliary *do* comes to the rescue.
- c) Further functional pressures exploit auxiliary *do* to help speakers to avoid ambiguities in questions that contain an object, and to put the markers of questioning and negation near to each other. These pressures are grammaticized as constraints on full verbs in some questions.
- d) Cognitive pressures for simplicity generalize these constraints to all full verbs, and re-express them as positive rules referring to auxiliary verbs.
- e) Cognitive and functional pressures (including sociolinguistic pressures) combine to make this newly-enriched category more easily recognizable by allowing auxiliaries alone to be reduced to clitics and to take reduced *n't*.
- f) Cognitive pressures for simplicity and harmony have removed some exceptions, and are still removing others, thus tidying up the effects of earlier changes.

DISCUSSION

Iskandarova in her article about grammaticalization process states that one of the transformations in the development of the language is considered to grammaticalization at a grammatical level. While losing their lexical meaning the words go through several stages. Thus, it could be concluded that grammaticalization has a gradual nature. The process of grammaticalization has three levels:

- 1) The words that have become the basis for grammaticalization
- 2) Partially grammaticalized words (analytic forms of the verbs (ko'makchilar), one part of postpositions(ko'makchilar))
- 3) Completely grammaticalized words (postpositions, conjunctions such as *uchun, kabi, singari, bilan*)

Turkic languages have about 25 verbs that can serve either as lexical or auxiliary verbs expressing TAM categories. The abbreviation TAM stands for tense, aspect and mood. Graschenkov in his works uses the terms TAM auxiliaries, TAM markers to describe the type of helping verbs which are equal to "ko'makchi fe'llar" in the Uzbek language. According to Hojiev, there are 27 lexical items in the Uzbek language that can be used either as independent lexical verbs or as TAM auxiliaries (or postverbal auxiliaries). As regular verbs they do not have any distinctive features from other verbal lexemes. However, when they are applied in the form of auxiliaries they have a fixed position after the meaning verb, and express significantly different meaning (Johanson 1995, Erdal 2004).

Graschenkov also calls grammaticalization, namely auxiliatation, a shift from lexical verbs to TAM markers, when the notion is applied to Turkic languages. He highlights the following properties of the Turkic auxiliary verb constructions where the second verb grammaticalizes and loses its primary meaning only indicating certain shades of the preceding verb:

1. They are created as a sequence of two or more verbs, the lexical verb coming first and the auxiliary verb follows it;
2. Such verb chain cannot be split;
3. It has the common phrasal stress;
4. The meaning of such construction is defined by the first lexical item;
5. Only verbs from a very limited group can serve as an auxiliary verb.

impossible to predict why, for instance, certain auxiliaries have a modal meaning while others carry a durative meaning. However, considering semantics of source items, one can find regular correlation among them and new grammatical categories: verbs of position and non-directional movement grammaticalize into durative/progressive markers; verbs of directional movement into resultative markers, perception verbs into modals and so on. Grashenkov detects the following most regular grammatical meanings among Turkic auxiliary verbs:

- 1) Duration and perfectivity (aspectual)
- 2) Attemptive and possibilitative (modal)
- 3) Applicativity
 - Lexemes used in the function of duration are **position verbs**: *qol, yot, o'tir* (*stay, lie, sit*)
 - The verbs of undirected movements: *bor* (*go, move*)
 - Perfective meaning is provided by the verbs of arrival/departure: *yur, ket, kel, qol* (*go, leave, come, remain*)
 - verbs of change of position/location: *qo'y, yubor* (*put, send*)
 - verbs of applicative function: *ol, ber* (*take, give*)

Take introduces an action benefactive for the subject and *give* denotes benefactivity for somebody else's sake.

- *Bil* (*know*) has a modal meaning of ability and attempt.

Attempts are also frequently introduced by the auxiliary verb *ko'r* (*see*), but it is unclear whether the doer succeeded.

CONCLUSION

The list of auxiliaries in Turkic languages, particularly in Uzbek remains close to the original during the last thousand years. Additionally, it must be noted that many lexical items provide the same grammatical meaning. Perfective and durative aspectual domains are the best examples.

REFERENCES

1. Ellegård, A. The Auxiliary DO: the Establishment and Regulation of its Use in English. Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm, 1953, p. 208
2. Givón, T. "Historical syntax and synchronic morphology", Chicago Linguistic Society, Proceedings 7, 1971 p.396
3. Grashenkov, P.V. Development of TAM categories in Turkic: feeling free in the deterministic system // Selected papers from SinFonIJA3 / Maja Markovic, ed. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012, p.62.
4. Hae-Yun Lee, The Grammaticalization of Aspectual Auxiliary Verbs in Korean, International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics, Vol. 1, No. 2, June 2015, pp.122-123
5. Hawkins, J. A. A performance theory of order and constituency. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 44
6. Hopper, P.J., Traugott, E. C. *Grammaticalization*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2003, p. 134
7. Hudson, R. *The rise of auxiliary do: verb-non-raising or category-strengthening?* Transactions of the Philological Society 95, 1997 p. 55

8. Johanson, L. Grammaticalization in Turkic languages. The Oxford book of grammaticalization. 2012, pp. 759-760
9. Khakimov, M. K. (2021). VISUAL POETIC TEXTS AS MULTISEMIOTIC SYSTEM. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (8), 185-188.
10. Kizi, Y. H. R. (2021). Category of informativity in visual poetic texts. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(9), 389-393.
11. Kizi, Y. H. R., & Kizi, N. D. A. (2022). On the study of the structure of phraseological units with toponymies in the English and uzbek languages.
12. Krug, M. Auxiliaries and Grammaticalization. In: Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds.) *Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, p. 550
13. Kuteva, T. Auxiliation: An enquiry into the nature of grammaticalization. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, p.1
14. Lamiroy, B., Drobnyaković, A. Auxiliaries and Grammaticalization: A Case Study of Germanic and Slavonic Languages. Grammaticalization and Pragmatics: Facts, Approaches, Theoretical Issues, 2009, p. 24
15. Newmeyer, F. J. "Deconstructing grammaticalization", *Language Sciences* 23.2-3 (special issue, Grammaticalization: A Critical Assessment, ed. Lyle Campbell), 2001, p.193
16. Steele, S. M. The category AUX as a language universal. In: J. Greenberg(ed.)1978a, p.42
17. Trudgill, P. (ed.). *Sociolinguistic Patterns in British English*. London: Arnold, 1978, p.78
18. Warner, A. *English Auxiliaries. Structure and history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, p.82
19. Yunusova, H. R. Q. (2021). VIZUAL POETIK MATNLARDA GRAFIK BIRLIKLAR TAHLILI (HOZIRGI O 'ZBEK SHE'RIYATI ASOSIDA). *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 1(7), 26-30.
20. Искандарова Ш. М. Луғавий бирликларнинг грамматикализация даражаси хусусида. Илмий хабарнома, АДУ, №4 2013 йил, 79 б
21. Шлуинский, А. «Бивербальные конструкции в тубаларском диалекте и их лексические ограничения» в сб. *Тубаларские этюды*, (ред.), Москва, 2009, стр.22
22. Юнусова, Х. (2022). Verbo-visual figures in poetic texts. *Globallashuv davrida tilshunoslik va adabiyotshunoslik taraqqiyoti hamda ta'lim texnologiyalari*, 1(1), 73-76.