ORIGINS OF FUNCTIONAL TRANSPOSITION WITHIN THE CATEGORY OF TIME AND SPACE PREPOSITIONS: LEXICALIZATION AND GRAMMATICALIZATION

Yurii Kovbasko
PhD, associate professor,
Vasyl Stefanyk PreCarpathian National University
ORCID 0000-0003-4638-3900

This paper is an attempt to reanalyze the established order within the category of parts of speech, in particular prepositions and adverbs, as the units from these categories are characterized by the highest level of functional transposition in the language. We argue that overlapping of the categories was caused by the inclination of the Old English grammarians to take over main grammatical rules and exceptions, class division, definitions etc. from the Latin language. At the same time, grammatical phenomena existing in Old English were ignored or fitted to the already adopted Latin definitions and rules. That led to confusions, misunderstandings and overlapping in the grammatical system of Old English. The paper addresses the processes of lexicalization and grammaticalization which, according to our hypothesis, are observed within the category of prepositions in Old English and predetermined subsequent functional transposition. The analysis explains the phenomenon of functional transposition of the units which are simultaneously ascribed to several categories, e.g. prepositions, adverbs, particles etc. The class of space and time prepositions has undergone lexical and grammatical transformations which were consequently institutionalized in the language and the units became subjects to functional-semantic and functional-grammatical transposition the results of which are observed in present-day English. The former process resulted in transposition of the meaning, sometimes metaphorical, and further functioning of these units as adverbs, particles etc.; whereas the latter led to purely grammatical usage of the units, for instance substitution of the category of cases in English, uprise of new grammatical prefixes, loss of rigidness in word order.
Key words*: preposition, lexicalization, grammaticalization, functional-semantic transposition, functional-grammatical transposition.*

ВИТОКИ ФУНКЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ ТРАНСПОЗИЦІЇ У МЕЖАХ КАТЕГОРІЇ ПРИЙМЕННИКІВ ЧАСУ ТА ПРОСТОРУ: ЛЕКСИКАЛІЗАЦІЯ ТА ГРАМАТИКАЛІЗАЦІЯ

Юрій Ковбаско
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
Прикарпатський національний університет ім. Василя Стефаника

Стаття є спробою переглянути вже встановлений порядок у межах категорії частин мови, зокрема між прийменниками та прислівниками, оскільки одиниці цих категорій характеризуються найвищим рівнем функціональної транспозиції у мові. Констатуємо, що перехрещення цих категорій спричинене тим, що основні граматичні правила та винятки, поділ частин мови, визначення тощо були запозичені з латинської мови. Водночас, особливості давньоанглійської мови ігнорувалися або підводилися під уже встановлені латинські правила та визначення. Це призвело до виникнення неоднозначності, плутанини та перехрещення категорій у граматичній системі мови. Стаття фокусується на процесах лексикалізації та граматикалізації, які, за нашою гіпотезою, мали місце у межах категорії прийменників у давньоанглійській мові та визначили подальшу функціональну транспозицію одиниць. Аналіз описує явище функціональної транспозиції одиниць, що наразі визначаються

як прийменники, прислівники, частки тощо. Категорія прийменників часу та простору зазнала лексичних та граматичних трансформацій, які з часом були інституціоналізовані у мові, а її одиниці стали об'єктами функціонально-семантичної та функціонально-граматичної транспозиції, результати якої ми спостерігаємо на сучасному етапі розвитку англійської мови. Перший процес призвів до транспозиції значення, інколи метафоричного, та подальшого функціонування цих одиниць як прислівників. У свою чергу другий процес сприяв виключно граматичному використанню одиниць, наприклад як заміни категорії відмінків, появі нових граматичних префіксів, послабленню порядку.

Ключові слова*: прийменник, лексикалізація, граматикалізація, функціонально-семантична транспозиція, функціонально-граматична транспозиція.*

ИСТОКИ ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ ТРАНСПОЗИЦИИ В РАМКАХ КАТЕГОРИИ ПРЕДЛОГОВ ВРЕМЕНИ И ПРОСТРАНСТВА: ЛЕКСИКАЛИЗАЦИЯ И ГРАММАТИКАЛИЗАЦИЯ

Юрий Ковбаско
кандидат филологических наук, доцент,
Прикарпатский национальный университет им. В. Стефаника

Статья является попыткой пересмотреть уже сложившийся порядок в категории частей речи, а именно между предлогами и наречиями, поскольку единицы этих категорий характеризируются самым высоким уровнем функциональной транспозиций в языке. Констатируем, что пересечение этих категорий обуславливается тем, что основные грамматические правила и исключения, деление на части речи, определение частей речи и т.д. были заимствованы с латинского языка. В тоже время, особенности древнеанглийского языка игнорировались или подводились под уже установленные латинские правила и определения. Это привело к возникновению неясности, двусмысленности и пересечению категорий в грамматической системе языка. Статья фокусируется на процессах лексикализации и грамматикализации, которые, за нашей гипотезой, имели место внутри категории предлогов в древнеанглийском языке и определили дальнейшую функциональную транспозицию единиц. Анализ описывает явление функциональной транспозиции единиц, что определяются как предлоги, наречия, частицы и т.д. Категория предлогов пространства и времени претерпела лексические и грамматические трансформации, которые со временем, были институционализированы в языке, а единицы категории стали объектами функционально-семантической и функционально-грамматической транспозиции, результаты которой можно наблюдать в современном английском языке. Первый процесс привел к транспозиции значения, иногда метафорического, и дальнейшего функционирования этих единиц как наречий. В свою очередь второй процесс сопутствовал исключительно грамматическому использованию единиц, например, их использование вместо категории падежей, возникновению новых грамматических префиксов, ослаблению порядку слов.

Ключевые слова*: предлог, лексикализация, грамматикализация, функционально-семантическая транспозиция, функционально-грамматическая транспозиция.*

Introduction. The problem of parts of speech as a universal concept seems to be one of the most elementary and unsophisticated phenomena, only if we perceive it formally and conventionally. Continuous repetition of well-established definitions, rules and exceptions has made it unnecessary and even unacceptable to review the deeply-rooted system of word classes in grammar and, correspondingly, any new analysis or scientific investigation is undoubtedly grounded on the previous research and on the same approaches. As a result, in Modern English it is possible to observe an extensive functional transposition of lexical units between the closed and open word

classes. Transposition processes within the open word classes have already been comprehensively studied, whereas the lexical items representing open and closed classes have not undergone thorough research and, therefore, we focus on these inter-paradigmatic shifts as being the least studied but at the same time widely used in the language.

The previous research (Kovbasko, 2016: 70) shows that in Modern English 49 lexical units are at the same time identified at least as prepositions and adverbs (*e.g. aboard, below, in, through etc.*) and, correspondingly, may ambiguously be defined as prepositions, adverbs, particles, adverbial particles or conjunctions, embracing characteristics of both notional (open class) and functional (closed class) to which they may belong. However, at the synchronic stage of language development it is just possible to state and observe how certain language phenomena function, but to explain them it is necessary to appeal to the diachronic element, to the origins of the processes.

We claim that any unit being referred to as a representative of a notional or functional class has been a subject to diachronic lexicalization or grammaticalization processes, in the course of which it becomes more lexicalized or grammaticalized and is transposed from one category into another, from notional into functional and vice versa. Therefore, the ***hypothesis*** proved in the paper states that diachronic mechanisms of grammaticalization and lexicalization within the class of space and time prepositions as fundamental language units triggered off functional-semantic and functional-grammatical transpositional processes the results of which are observed in Modern English.

Constantly growing scientific appeal to grammaticalization and lexicalization theories which is being observed in linguistics and which is aimed at reconstructing some of the linguistic foundations, has led to a number of works in the mentioned spheres, concerning lexicalization, see: *development of present participle adjectives, prepositions and conjunctions; prepositional verbs*; *discourse markers* (O'Dowd, 1998; Brinton and Traugott, 2005), *complex prepositions* (Ramat, 1992; Lehmann, 2002); any *adoption of a unit into a lexicon,* like "*association of two free units through derivation or compounding to yield a new complex unit*" (Hagege, 1993), "*idiomaticization*" (Bauer, 1988) and other *synchronic and diachronic processes* (Anttila, 1989; Hopper and Traugott, 1993).

Grammaticalization is more strictly focused on grammatical phenomena either general: *tense and aspect* (Dahl, 1985; Bybee and Dahl, 1989), *modality* (Traugott and Dasher, 2004; Ziegeler, 2011), *spatial orientation* (Heine, 1997; Sipocz, 2005) or specific: *copulas* (Devitt, 1994; Katz, 1996), *particles of phrasal verbs* (Brinton and Traugott, 2005; Los, 2006), *passives* (Haspelmath, 1990; Wiemer, 2015), *demonstratives* (Diessel, 1999; Catasso, 2011), *articles* (Himmelmann, 1997; Mulder and Carlier, 2011), *adverbs* (Heine, 1991; Haspelmath, 1997; Killie, 2014), *prepositions* (Seppänen, Bowen and Trotta 1994; Schwenter and Traugott, 1995; Akimoto, 1999; Hoffmann, 2005).

Nevertheless, studies on lexicalization and grammaticalization in their majority refer to complex prepositions in synchrony but not to simple or compound prepositions and their diachronic aspects, what is generally represented in the current paper and,

therefore, specifies its ***novelty***. Another ***contribution*** of the paper is interpretation of lexicalization and grammaticalization as mutually interrelated basic approaches in functional transposition processes in-between open and closed word classes, what has not been developed before. The ***aim of the paper*** is to analyze historical mechanisms of grammaticalization and lexicalization within the class of space and time prepositions which have resulted in synchronic transposition processes and further overlapping of prepositions and lexical units which currently belong to the word classes of adverbs, conjunctions and/or particles. To achieve the aim the following ***tasks*** have been specified: 1) to analyze lexicalization as a diachronic mechanism contributed to functional-semantic transposition; 2) to study possible ways of lexicalization of prepositions and the outcomes of the process; 3) to study grammaticalization as one of the diachronic mechanisms which has led to functional-grammatical transposition between prepositions and other word classes; 4) to single out major grammatical changes that have led to deeper grammaticalization of prepositions.

Results and discussion

Lexicalization as a precondition for functional-semantic transposition within the class of spatio-temporal prepositions

In traditional grammar prepositions belong to the closed word class "with relatively fixed membership; and new prepositions are rarely coined" (Jurafsky and Martin, 2005: 139). It means that there are an already established, fixed number of prepositions and there is certain perplexity to introduce new units into it; so ordinary synchronic means of word formation just do not work in this case. Prepositions compose a fundamental language class representing primary categories of time and space and, consequently, all basic relations that may take place in the spatio-temporal scope were specified at the earliest stage of human existence and language formation. No new direct spatio-temporal relations appear and no new prepositions are added to the class. However, in the course of time human consciousness has been developing indirect or metaphorical comprehension of time and space, trying to capture them in the language. Thereby, each metaphorical or indirect representation is obligatory based on the fundamental relations already expressed by institutionalized prepositions. That is why speakers are obliged to take advantage of primary prepositions in order to create new metaphorical units representing spatio-temporal relations of the second order.

To describe semantic significance of the units we introduce the term "semantic order", which is the order in which meanings are actualized. Concerning prepositions we argue the necessity to differentiate between their usage in the first and second semantic order. In the first semantic order we find those primary one-word or compound prepositions which signify direct relations of time and space:

*1) The team is caring for growing numbers ill **on the South Coast**, ...*

*2) The third annual report for 1990/91, subtitled 'Bringing it Home' was published **on 21 June**...*

*3) **Over the last three years**, our volunteers have provided much love and...*

*4) After breakfast one of the men returned with an umbrella; everyone else worked with scarves draped **over heads** and necks against the sun.*

Examples 1-4 represent prepositions *on/over* which directly signify relations of time and space expressed by NP complements *'the South Coast', '21 June', 'the last 3 years', 'heads'*.

It is possible to speak of the second semantic order when prepositions are used either as parts of other compounds, in which they lose their semantic significance and become auxiliary elements specifying the meaning of the main constituent, usually indirectly and metaphorically; or when they are used not in their primary function as prepositions but as other parts of speech, for instance:

*5) ... well, don't just sit **around** waiting for the telephone to ring.*

*6) The most common way for the virus to spread is **through** unprotected sexual intercourse between two people, one of whom is infected.*

*7) Amnesty's job is to breach these walls, to discover the truth **within**, and...*

In example 5 preposition **around** is used as a part of phrasal verb, a combination in which spatio-temporal meaning of **around** is distorted and shifted into the background. In example 6 preposition **through** is used indirectly, when the meaning of time and space is transposed on other relations in the sense *by means of*. Example 7 shows the usage of preposition **within** (not adverb, see Kovbasko, 2014, 2016) not in the primary spatial meaning, however, it can be reconstructed from the context, but also metaphorically, with the transferred idea of space. While being used in their second semantic order prepositions of time, space and direction partially lose or diminish their "functional power" and grammatical significance.

To our mind, prepositions belong to the fundamental parts of speech and were exclusively used for signifying relations of time and space and we argue that initially all of them actualized semantics of the first order, i.e. to the class of prepositions belong the units specifying relations of time, space and direction. However, in the course of time the language has developed and evolved, with all lexical units undergoing mutual internal and external influence, disappearing, changing their forms or functions. This has led to various transformations among the parts of speech. Prepositions as representatives of the basic word class could not be affected by derivation or compounding as their semantic meaning was too weak to constitute the root and main component for the affix to be added to. On the other hand, they could not be used like ordinary affixes, as they possess certain semantic meaning that is enough to modify or specify any notional word but is not enough to form a notional word. Therefore, it has led to functional-semantic transposition stemming from the process of lexicalization.

Lexicalization is a mental phenomenon and as Chendan (2018) states it is a process of structural innovation in language change, which is motivated by a human cognitive ability of structural boundary assignment in the construction of linguistic structures. In this process, the first innovative form may be a result of a language user's intentional violation of a structural organization rule for a certain communicative aim. The presumption that the process of lexicalization, as well as grammaticalization, is mentally and cognitively preconditioned leads to comprehension of the phenomenon, as it upholds the proposed idea of transposing prepositions to the second semantic order, i.e. metaphorically. Another precondition of the same rank is a communicative purpose, i.e. the necessity to introduce a new word for better communication, to

denominate a new phenomenon etc. One more significant point is that lexicalization causes intentional violations either syntactical or semantic, because, at first, newly-coined structures function along with appropriate units/structures, till the former are institutionalized or the latter go out of usage, for example:

*8) þa wæs eft swa **ær** ellenrofum fletsittendum fægere gereorded niowan stefne*

*8a) then again it was as **before** for the men vigorous in valor …* (Donoghue, 2018: 114)

Examples 8 and 8a represent the transformation due to which preposition ***ær,*** which was frequently in use in Old English, started its decay, firstly functioning along with preposition ***before***.

This approach to lexicalization provides us with a rather extra-linguistic explanation; however, linguists in their majority avoid involving extra-linguistic information, focusing on purely word-formation properties of the process. Thus, Lipka (2002: 111) stresses the fact that lexicalization causes the integration of a syntactic or word-formation syntagma into the lexicon (today often referred to by institutionalization), with semantic and/or formal properties which are not completely derivable from either the constituents or the word-formation pattern. According to such approach the emphasis is predominantly made not on simple lexical units but syntagmas, multi-word expressions and set phrases (Hilpert, 2019), the meaning of which is not derivable from the constituents. We may partially agree with such explanation, as the meaning of new lexical items coined with the help of prepositions is not just a simple combination of two independent meanings. On the one hand, it is possible to speak about the use of prepositions in their first semantic order when their meanings modify/specify the meaning of a notional word, the so-called collocations, e.g. ***in view of, on time, at once*** etc. On the other hand, the problem appears when prepositions which take part in the process of lexicalization are used in their second semantic order, what means that they have fully or partially lost their basic spatio-temporal signification. In such instance we can say that they undergo idiomatization, cf. ***turn up – a)*** to turn a switch on a machine such as an *oven*, radio etc so that it produces more heat, sound etc.*; **b)*** to be found, especially by chance, after having been lost or searched for; **c)** to arrive at a place, especially in a way that is unexpected; **d)** if an opportunity or situation turns up, it happens, especially when you are not expecting it; **e)** to shorten a skirt, trousers etc by folding up the bottom and sewing it (Longman English Dictionary). In all cases preposition **up** modifies the meaning of the verb **turn**, the sense of which remains predominant, while the sense of **up** is secondary and metaphorically shows spatio-temporal relations. Idiomatization is just one of the aspects of lexicalization which, in fact, is a broader term. Bauer (1983: 49) stresses that "opacity is not a necessary pre-requisite for lexicalization since some lexicalized forms may remain perfectly transparent". Therefore, we do not support the idea of lexicalization as "forming compulsory multi-word expressions and set phrases". Another point is that lexicalization is a diachronic process and it is necessary to take into account the word order in Old English when a standard place for a preposition was not just preceding a noun/noun phrase, but before a verb (Sweet, 1892). Such positioning before a verb brought about another aspect of lexicalization, similar to

compounding, when a preposition is lexicalized, i.e. it loses its grammatical power to become a part of a newly created word. In traditional grammar such cases are usually treated as a type of compounding (preposition +noun/verb) (Aarts, Chalker & Weiner, 2014: 34). However, we argue that this is the case of lexicalization as comparing with other types of traditional compounding (verb+verb, noun+noun, noun+verb etc.) when a compound can be decomposed and the meaning can be easily comprehended. In the case of lexicalized prepositions as parts of newly coined lexical items, if we decompose the latter it means that we intentionally delexicalize the preposition and it again attains its "grammatical power" and is used in its first semantic order, cf.:

9) stonewall – the wall made of stone

9a) overbook – to book over "the limit"

10) babysit – to sit with a baby

10a) underestimate – to estimate under "the certain level"

11) badmouth – to mouth badly

11a) upstage – stage in the "up" corner

In examples 9-11 we present traditional compounds, which in the process of decomposing form logical word-groups whose complete meanings are identical to those of compounds. On the other hand, in examples 9a-11a we provide instances of lexicalization, as these lexical items after decomposing do not form meaningful word-groups. In each case of decomposition, it is necessary to add spatio-temporal signification to get the complete idea of the word-group.

Herewith, quite relevant is the remark made by Quirk et al. (1985: 1525) that lexicalization is the process of creating a new word (a complex lexical item) for a (new) thing or notion instead of describing this thing or notion in a sentence or with a paraphrase, as in case of lexicalized prepositions we in fact omit multi-word paraphrases.

Such understanding correlates with the ideas argued by Hopper and Traugott, who regard lexicalization as "incorporation and fossilization of earlier independent grammatical morphemes into lexical material, when syntactic phrase or construction becomes a single word" (Hopper & Traugott, 2008: 127); and Cabrera (1998), saying that lexicalization is a process when a phrase or syntactically-determined lexical item becomes a full-fledged lexical item in itself or the process of creating lexical items out of syntactic units.

Besides, it should be mentioned that in case of prepositions we have to speak of primary lexicalization, "the process that turns linguistic material into lexical items", in contrast to secondary lexicalization "the process that renders lexical items still more lexical" (Brinton, 2002: 75).

Therefore, discussion over lexicalization of prepositions led us to ***following conclusions***:

- Prepositions may be used in their first (direct representation of relations) or second (indirect/metaphorical representation of relations) semantic order, and be lexicalized in these orders respectively;

- Being lexicalized in the first semantic order, prepositions actualize their primary meanings and form the so-called complex prepositions and collocations;

- When in the process of lexicalization second semantic order is actualized preposition form phrasal verbs;

- Lexicalization of prepositions is an optional diachronic process when a preposition fully or partially loses its grammatical power/potential and actualizes semantic meaning of the first or second order to become a part of a newly coined lexical item or a phrase, which can be fossilized or idiomatized.

Grammaticalization as a mechanism of functional-grammatical transposition of spatio-temporal prepositions

Some linguists (Ramat, 1992; van der Auwera, 2002) contemplate lexicalization as the reversal of grammaticalization and, hence, a type of "degrammaticalization". Others (Norde, 2001; Lehmann, 2002) tend to differentiate between them. Kurylovych (1965) made an attempt to combine these points of view stating that grammaticalization is the increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or from a less grammatical to a more grammatical status. In this respect, Traugott (2002) distinguishes between primary and secondary grammaticalization and lexicalization respectively.

Being a reversal of lexicalization grammaticalization, however, is also purely diachronic phenomenon, which "is usually thought of as that subset of linguistic changes whereby a lexical item or construction in certain uses takes on grammatical characteristics or through which a grammatical item becomes more grammatical" (Hopper and Traugott, 2008: 2). Heine and Reh (1984: 15) understand grammaticalization as "an evolution whereby linguistic units lose in semantic complexity, pragmatic significance, syntactic freedom and phonetic substance, respectively". In his turn, Sweester (1988: 345) adds that "in cases of grammaticalization, …, there is less elaboration of the source meanings than in lexical change, but the grammatical meaning is added".

Taking into account the object of the research, viz. prepositions of time and space, such explanations apparently make a lot of sense. Since we argue that initial lexical meaning of these units was signification of time, space and direction in their first (direct) or second (indirect) semantic order, it makes possible to state that prepositions were lexical items. On the other hand, lexical meanings of prepositions are reflected in their functional use as grammatical units. Thirdly, it is necessary to remember that grammaticalization is purely diachronic process and it is irrelevant to focus exclusively on some synchronic stages. Therefore, it seems logical that prepositions of time and space have undergone both types of grammaticalization – primary and secondary.

Primary grammaticalization of prepositions of time and space took place in case when prepositions were used in their first semantic order, i.e. representing spatio-temporal relations. At the current level of language development preposition is traditionally defined as "a word that governs, normally precedes, a noun or pronoun and which expresses the latter's relation to another word" (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 603). However, it is true to mention that many linguists just try to omit giving direct definitions, stating predominantly their functions etc. (Greenbaum and Nelson, 2013; Downing and Locke, 2006), and if we take definitions in the diachronic

perspective it is almost always said that prepositions govern the objective case (Frazee and Wells, 1921; Fernald, 1904). And this is the moment when a need to address Old English grammar is required.

To our mind, an erroneous statement concerning the connection between two notions/names/nouns/substantives/subject etc., was established in grammatical traditions and gave rise to the obligatory occurrence of the so-called nominal complement – "nouns or pronouns or other noun-equivalents (words functioning like nouns – noun, pronoun, adjective, infinitive, gerund, phrase, clause" (Mahato, 1976: 1). In practice in Old English, when the system of cases was widely elaborated, prepositions always designated fundamental relations of time and space, regardless of the types of cases they were followed by. Their role was not to join a specific case to the previous elements, but to specify the relation of time and space, realized by nouns or noun-equivalents in various cases. It resulted in the fact that one and the same preposition could precede different cases and even different parts of speech and "one and the same prepositions may have different significations due to cases after it. The difference of meaning does not really reside in the preposition itself, but has sprung out of the different cases before which it is placed" (Mason, 1881: 113), cf.

12) ***under*** *Heorotes hrof*
13) heard ***under*** *helme*
14) hæleð ***under*** *heofenum,*
15) se scynscaþa ***under*** *sceadu bregdan*
16) ***under*** *geapne hrof*

In examples 12-16 preposition ***under*** is presented in combination with different noun cases: in 12 under is followed by ***genitive and nominative cases***; in 13 – ***by dative (sing)***; in 14 – ***by dative (pl)***; in 15 – ***by nominative***; in 16 – ***by accusative + nominative***.

It testifies that a preposition "does not cause the use of the particular case that follows it. Its original function was to modify or define the vague signification of the case before which it is placed" (Mason, 1881: 112) and, consequently specify the signification of the verb it was connected with. To our mind, the relations between the verb and preposition (prepositional dependent), we are not taking into account phrasal verbs now, are much more substantial than those between the preposition and noun (prepositional complement). It is explained by a simple reconstruction, see e.g.

17) … occasional jeep was still passing by with its dead or wounded ***aboard***,

From the sentence itself it is possible to reconstruct the means of transport with "***dead or wounded***", so it is possible to omit this as a complement after aboard. Nevertheless, it is not possible in case of a verb phrase, in other words prepositional dependent – "***still passing***", neither from the sentence, nor from discourse and omitting it we may misunderstand the whole discourse.

Thus, any type of prepositional complement, i.e. noun or noun-equivalent, can be reconstructed from discourse, whereas it is impossible to reconstruct prepositional dependent, i.e. verb or verb-equivalent. We explain this by the fact that a landmark we are referring to, as to its positioning in time, space or direction, can be the same throughout discourse or at least be repetitive, its positioning is represented by a

preposition, but the action or the course of it, designated by a verb, is constantly changing.

Therefore, when the system of cases in Old English started to decay, prepositions of time, space and direction started their grammaticalization. Before this process noun cases had determined the direction of the movement in time and space designated by verbs and prepositions were mainly those connective elements between nouns and verbs. However, in the course of grammaticalization, prepositions took over the role of cases (were grammaticalized) and took the lead in signifying the direction of verbs. We argue that this process not just deprived the English language of cases, but transposed prepositions from the secondary/auxiliary parts of speech into the primary parts of speech on a par with nouns and verbs, what corroborates our previous assumption concerning fundamental nature of prepositions as lexical units representing basic spatio-temporal relations.

As a result of grammaticalization and corresponding replacement of the cases of nouns, prepositions took upon themselves those functions which had not been intrinsic to them before, i.e. functions previously represented by cases. As Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 601) state "in their grammaticalized uses, prepositions often serve the same kind of functions as inflectional cases".

Hence, we argue that only in the process of grammaticalization fundamental prepositions of time, space, direction started acquiring new functions, being substitute for cases, and new subtypes of prepositions, or in other words new relations shown by prepositions, appeared in the language. Due to this, many prepositions obtained new metaphorical meanings, i.e. started being used in their second semantic order. Apart from time and space relations, for instance Mahato (1976) enumerates method and manner, reason and purpose, possession; Quirk et al. (1985) range the cause-purpose spectrum (cause, reason, motive, purpose, destination, target) and meaning/agentive spectrum (manner, means, instrument, agentive, stimulus); Curme (1922) provides circumstance of manner, cause or reason, purpose or end, means material, modal expression. Therefore, this process makes it possible to speak of functional-grammatical transposition within the class of spatio-temporal prepositions, as being grammaticalized prepositions could realize functions which were new for them and, at the same time, remain their primary grammatical functions.

Another aspect of grammaticalization of prepositions, but not their functional-grammatical transposition, took place in Old English. In this case we are referring to lexical units *"a", "bi/be"*, which in Old English functioned as prepositions of time and space, but which in the process of grammaticalization completely lost their lexical meaning, syntactic freedom and phonetic substance and were transformed into inseparable prefixal morphemes, cf.:

*18) þæt hit **a** mid gemete manna ænig*
*18a) That it **amid** meeting men any*
*19) **a** mæg god wyrcan wunder æfter wundre*
*19a) **On** kinsman god make wonder after wonder*
20) þætte suð ne norð be sæm tweonum
*20a) that south not north **be** seas tween*

From example 18 it is possible to observe that Old English preposition *a* merged with *mid* forming a new lexical item *amid*; in example 19 preposition *a* was substituted in Middle/Modern English by preposition *on*; in example 20 preposition *be* merged with numeral tween forming new preposition *between*.

In historical linguistics there is no unanimous approach towards the analysis of the abovementioned lexical units. Goold (1851: 206) states that "the word *a*, when it does not denote one thing of a kind, is not an article, but a genuine *preposition*; being probably the same as the French *à*, signifying *to, at, on, in*, or *of*. As a preposition, *a* has generally become a *prefix*, or what the grammarians call an inseparable preposition; as *abed* – in bed; *aboard* – on board; etc."; Poutsma (1926: 619) declares that "second adverbs are formed by prefixes: the commonest are *'a'* and *'be'*. The adverbial prefix *'a'* represents a weakened form of the OE *an* (or on) of various values, chiefly those of the Modern English *'on'* or *'of'*. The adverbial prefix *'be'* is a weakened form of the preposition *by*"; Fleay (1884: 124) mentions that "there are many particles which can be placed at the beginning of words, such as *under, pre, syn* etc. these are called prefixes and are nearly all of prepositional origin, indicating position in space and time. Their function is attributive"; Clarke (1852) claims that there are no difference between particles, prepositions and prefixes. In our point of view, we, in fact, deal with grammaticalization of prepositions, which was triggered by the language economy, that is the way adverbs were introduced into the language and due to phonology of Old English, as Sievers (1885: 86) mentions "that the final *'n'* of the preposition *'on'* is frequently lost when it occurs in a compound word or stereotyped phrase and the prefix then appears as *'a'*", so for example it's easier to say "*all aboard*", instead of "*all on board*".

It should be mentioned that this type of grammaticalization has nothing to do with the process of functional-grammatical transposition as, the former is characterized by unidirectionality, the claim that grammaticalization is irreversible and "grammatical elements do not turn back in the direction of the lexicon" (Kalachev, 2002: 9), while in transposition the unit being transposed may return to its initial form or function.

Finally, prepositions of time and space became the subject to degrammaticalization. It is worth noting that we do not regard the process of degrammaticalization to be equivalent to the process of lexicalization, as some linguists do (Ramat, 1992; van der Auwera, 2002). We point out that in case of prepositions degrammaticalization leads not to their complete transition into the class of lexical items, but to some partial loss or weakening of the already institutionalized grammatical characteristics. That is the case of the so-called stranded prepositions. The process of stranding presupposes "that the nominal complement is fronted to initial position in the clause, and the preposition is placed at the end, the prepositional phrase being consequently discontinuous" (Downing and Locke, 2006: 556), e.g.:

*21) … 'she was the very devil of a horseman to look **at**!*

*22) How much weight are you putting **on**?*

To a great extent English grammar owes Latin and the name "*preposition*", their functions and their positioning before nouns are not the exclusions. Due to this in the Middle English grammar there was a considerable prejudice against the so-called

stranded prepositions (Aarts, Chalker & Weiner, 2014: 324). For instance, Ussher (1803) mentioned that "prepositions should never be placed after the noun or pronoun, which they govern". In fact, during the 17th-19th centuries stranding of prepositions was rather a violation of the norm and grammatical rules, erroneous usage, whereas classical word order was regarded as grammatically correct. In the course of the 20th-21st centuries linguists distinguish between the classical use of prepositions as a representation of a very formal style and stranded prepositions as the examples of informal speech (Quirk et al, 1985). Thus, we assume that over the next century in the course of language development stranded prepositions will surpass classical prepositional word order (*we are talking about cases when both types of word order are possible*) making the latter obsolete. We also argue that this is the example of degrammaticalization as the already institutionalized word order when prepositions obligatory preceded their complements in the course of time grew weaker and the syntactic order out of strict turned to be loose and, hence, the construction has lost its rigid grammatical nature. Moreover, we suppose this to be an example of functional-grammatical transposition, because prepositions started functioning in the way which was not inherent to them and this new phenomenon has already been institutionalized both in language and grammars, but, at the same time, the initial word order has not been completely deinstitutionalized.

Therefore, having discussed grammaticalization of prepositions of time and space it is possible to ***conclude***:

- Changes in grammatical system of the Old English language caused grammaticalization of prepositions of time and place which, in its turn, resulted in substitution of cases by prepositions;

- Grammaticalization led to functional-grammatical transposition when in Middle and Modern English prepositions started expressing those relations which in OE were denoted by case endings and that is why there appeared a number of new subtypes of prepositions or prepositions designating other relations, not only of time and space;

- In Old English system of prepositions unidirectional grammaticalization of some prepositions has been registered, i.e. **'a', 'be'** etc. lost their semantic complexity, pragmatic significance, syntactic freedom and phonetic substance and became inseparable prefixes;

- The class of prepositions has undergone the process of degrammaticalization as well, when the practice of preposition stranding was introduced, which has led to the loss of grammatical rigidness of the word order.

Conclusion. From the linguistic and philosophical points of view prepositions of time and space are fundamental parts of speech on a par with nouns and verbs, which were functioning to denote and specify primary human activities, expressed by nouns and verbs, and, thus, were the apexes in the deictic triad. It means that they were basic elements in other parts of speech formation. However, the expansion of the very class of prepositions ceased as the existing units covered all direct spatio-temporal relations and consequently the class of prepositions became closed.

In the process of world perception and language development a necessity to represent other types of relations emerged and prepositions of time and space had to evolve to meet the needs and this reflected in two processes – lexicalization and grammaticalization. To our mind, it is possible to speak of both processes as prepositions are rather unique units. On the one hand, they are functional/grammatical items representing the connections between the notion and the action, while on the other hand they bear certain semantics, meaning of those spatio-temporal relations. Therefore, prepositions became subjects both to lexicalization and grammaticalization.

Grammaticalization of prepositions is a diachronic process, which could be presupposed by some other grammatical changes in the language, as a result of which prepositions partially lose their semantic meaning and start functioning more as a grammatical item than a lexical-grammatical unit denoting time or space.

Lexicalization of prepositions is an optional diachronic process when a preposition fully or partially loses its grammatical power/potential and actualizes semantic meaning of the first or second order to become a part of a newly coined lexical item or a phrase, which can be fossilized or idiomatized.

Main challenge faced by the class of prepositions in the course of their evolution became the changes in the Old English grammatical system, when the system of noun cases declined and prepositions, which were in direct interrelationship with nouns, started their grammaticalization and were the units to substitute the system of cases. Being grammaticalized prepositions of time and place started expressing previously extrinsic relations which were metaphorically and indirectly developed under the influence of noun cases. This led to the development of new subtypes of prepositions which are still in use. Another example of grammaticalization was unidirectional transformation of some prepositions into inseparable prefixes, as the process was characterized by their losing semantic complexity, pragmatic significance, syntactic freedom and phonetic substance. At the same time, the class of prepositions passed through the process of degrammaticalization, which reflected in stranding prepositions, according to which prepositions weakened grammatical rigidness of word order.

Lexicalization processes have been taking place alongside grammaticalization of prepositions. Changes described above stimulated prepositions to develop their own indirect/metaphorical way of representation relations in addition to the direct one – of time and place. We call them second and first semantic order respectively. Being lexicalized in their first semantic order, prepositions actualize spatio-temporal semantics and form the so-called complex prepositions and collocations, i.e. new lexical items previously not existing in the language. When second semantic order is actualized preposition form the so-called phrasal verbs, new lexical units as well, verbs whose meanings are modified/specified by prepositions in their second semantic order.

The study focuses on the mechanisms of grammaticalization and lexicalization within the class of space and time prepositions, specifies those grammatical and lexical processes which prepositions have undergone throughout their development and explains the current state of affairs within the abovementioned word class.

Grammaticalization and lexicalization of prepositions are diachronic processes which can be interrelated or take place individually, and due to the lexical-grammatical

nature of prepositions they both lead to functional-semantic and functional-grammatical transposition. However, the process of transposition is obligatory followed by institutionalization, i.e. the process when any lexical or grammatical change is accepted and conventionalized in society and grammar books. Correspondingly, transposition is a synchronic-diachronic process, which describes any possible lexical or grammatical transpositional change, which takes place at a certain synchronic level, but is extensively prolonged in time what, in fact, determinates its diachronic nature.

Thus, we argue that namely diachronic mechanisms of grammaticalization and lexicalization transformed spatio-temporal prepositions to the extent, which potentiates functional-grammatical and functional-semantic transposition of the units between different word classes. Further research in the field is of critical importance as it will allow distinguishing more clearly the open and closed word classes both in Old and Modern English, as well as to carry out the reanalysis of the units belonging to them.

References

Aarts, B., Chalker, S & Weiner, E. (2014). The *Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar. 2nd ed.* Oxford: OUP.

Akimoto, M. (1999). The Idiomatization and Grammaticalization of Complex Prepositions. In Hwang, S.J.J. & Lommel, A.R. (eds.) *LACUS Forum XXV*, Fullerton, CA: *389-397.*

Anttila, R. (1989). *Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Auwera, van der J. (2002). More Thoughts on Degrammaticalization. In Wischer, I. & Diewald, G. (eds.) *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*: 19-29.

Bauer, L. (1983). *English Word Formation*. Cambridge: CUP.

Bauer, L. (1988). *Introducing Linguistic Morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Brinton, L.J. (2002). Grammaticalization versus Lexicalization Reconsidered. On the Late Use of Temporal Adverbs. In Fanego, T., Perez-Guerra, J., & Lopez-Couso, M.J. (eds.) *English Historical Syntax and Morphology*: 67-97. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.223.07bri

Brinton, L.J. & Traugott, E.C. (2005). *Lexicalization and Language Change*. Cambridge: CUP.

Bybee, J.L. & Dahl, O. (1989). The Creation of Tense and Aspect Systems in the Languages of the World. *Studies in Language,* 13-1: 51-103.

Cabrera, J.C.M. (1998). On the Relationship between Grammaticalization and Lexicalization. In Ramat, A.G. & Hopper P.J. (eds.) *The Limits of Grammaticalization.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company: 211-227.

Catasso, N. (2011). The Grammaticalization of Demonstratives: A Comparative Analysis. *Journal of Universal language*, 12-1:7-46. https://doi.org/10.22425/jul.2011.12.1.7

Chendan, L. (2018). Boundary Assignment: A Cognitive Motivation for Lexicalization. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics,* 6 (4): 110-117.

Clarke, H. (1852). *A Grammar of the English Tongue, Spoken and Written*. London: John Weale.

Curme, G. (1922). *A Grammar of the German Language*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Dahl, O. (1985). *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Donoghue, D. (2018). *How the Anglo-Saxons Read their Poems*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Devitt, D. (1994). *Copula Constructions in Cross-linguistic and Diachronic Perspective*. Diss. Buffalo.

Diessel, H. (1999). *Demonstratives: Form, Function and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Downing, A. & Locke, P. (2006). *English Grammar. A University Course. 2ⁿᵈ ed.* London, New York: Routledge.

Fernald, J. (1904). *Connectives of English Speech*. New York: Fung & Wagnalls Company.

Fleay, F.G. (1884). *The Logical English Grammar*. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

Frazee, S.I. & Wells, Ch. (1921). *Grammar and Practice*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Goold, B. (1851). *The Grammar of English Grammars*. New York: Samuel S. & William Wood.

Greenbaum, S. & Nelson G. (2009). *An Introduction to English Grammar. 3ʳᵈ ed*. London: Routledge.

Hagege, C. (1993). *The Language Builder: An Essay on the Human Signature in Linguistic Morphogenesis*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Haspelmath, M. (1990). The Grammaticalization of Passive Morphology. *Studies in Language*. 14-1: 25-72.

Haspelmath, M. (1997). *From Space to Time. Temporal Adverbials in the World's Languages*. Munchen, Newcastle: Lincom Europa.

Heine, B. & Reh, M. (1984). *Grammaticalization and Reanalysis in African languages*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Heine, B. (1991). *Grammaticalization: a Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Heine, B. (1997). *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. Oxford: OUP

Hilpert, M. (2019). *Lexicalization in Morphology*. Oxford Research Encyclopedias.

Himmelmann, N. (1997). *Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase. Zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Hoffmann, S. (2005). *Grammaticalization and English Complex Prepositions. A Corpus-Based Study.* London, New York: Routledge.

Hopper, P.J. & Traugott, E.C. (2008). *Grammaticalization. 2ⁿᵈ ed*. Cambridge: CUP

Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G.K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: CUP.

Jurafsky, D. & Martin, H.-J. (2005). *Speech and Language Processing: An Introduction to Natural Language Processing, Computational Linguistics and Speech Recognition*. NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kalachev, N. (2002). Grammaticalization, Lexicalization and Russian Amalgams. *Graduate students theses, dissertations and professional papers*. Available at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/7833

Katz, A. (1996). *Cyclical Grammaticalization and the Cognitive Link between Pronoun and Copula*. Diss., Rice University.

Killie, K. (2014). Secondary Grammaticalization and the English Adverbial -ly Suffix. *Language Sciences*, 47 (Part B): 199-214.

Kovbasko, Yu. (2014). K voprosu o grammaticheskoj transpozicii narechij i predlogov mesta. In Bazarbaeva, Z. et al. (eds.) *Jazyk i kul'tura. Monografija*. Novosibirsk: TSRNS: 12-29.

Kovbasko, Yu. (2016). Temporal and Locative Prepositions versus Adverbs: Lexical and Grammatical Overlapping (corpus-based study). *Advanced education*, 6: 69-75. https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.77941

Kuryłowicz, J. (1965). The Evolution of Grammatical Categories. *Diogenes*, 13-51: 55-7

Lehmann, Ch. (2002). New Reflections on Grammaticalization and Lexicalization. In Wischer, I. & Diewald, G. (eds.) *New Reflections on Grammaticalization:* 1–18.

Lipka, L. (2002). *English Lexicology. Lexical Structure, Word Semantics and Word-Formation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Los, B. (2006). Particles as Grammaticalized Complex Predicates. *English Historical Linguistics*: 157-179.

Mahato, P. (1976). *A Guide to English Grammar, Composition and Translation*. New Delhi: Orient Longman limited.

Mason, C.P. (1881). *English Grammar including Grammatical Analysis*. London: Bell & Sons.

Mulder, de W. & Carlier, A. (2011). The Grammaticalization of Definite Articles. In Heine B. & Narrog H. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization.*

Norde, M. (2001). Deflexion as a Counterdirectional Factor in Grammatical Change. *Language Sciences,* 23:2-3: 231-264.

O'Dowd, E.M. (1998). *Prepositions and Particles in English. A Discourse-Functional Account.* Oxford: OUP.

Poutsma, H. (1926). *A Grammar of Late Modern English. Part 2.The Parts of Speech. Section II. The Verb and the Particles.* Groningen: P. Noordhoff.

Quirk, R. et al. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman.

Ramat, P. (1992). Thoughts on Degrammaticalization. *Linguistics* 30: 549-560.

Seppänen, A., Bowen, R. & Trotta, J. (1994). On the So-called Complex Prepositions. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 29: 3-29.

Schwenter, S.A. & Traugott, E.C. (1995). The Semantic and Pragmatic Development of Substitutive Complex Prepositions in English. In Jucker, A.H. (ed.) *Historical Pragmatics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 243–273.

Sievers, E. (1885). *An Old English Grammar.* Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co.

Sipocz, K. (2005). Spatial Orientation and Grammaticalization. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica,* Vol. 52 (4): 411-425.

Sweester, E.E. (1988). Grammaticalization and Semantic Bleaching. *The 14ᵗʰ Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society.* California.

Sweet, H. (1892). *A New English Grammar. Logical and Historical. Part 1.* London: OUP.

Traugott, E.C. (2002). From Etymology to Historical Pragmatics. In Minkova, D. & Stockwell, R. (eds.) *Studies in the History of the English Language: A Millennial Perspective.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 19-49.

Traugott, E.C. & Dasher, R.B. (2004). *Regularity in Semantic Change.* Cambridge: CUP.

Ussher, G.N. (1803). *The Elements of English Grammar.* Haverhill: Galen H. Fay.

Wiemer, B. (2015). The Grammaticalization of Passives. In Heine B. & Narrog H. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization.*

Ziegeler, D. (2011). The Grammaticalization of Modality. In Heine B. & Narrog H. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization.*