**Grammaticalization**

Hopper and Traugott (1993:2-4)

*Be going to/be gonna* illustrates several processes typical of grammaticalization.

(a) “The change occurs only in a very local context, that of purposive directional complements with non-finite complements, such as *I am going to marry Bill* (i.e., *I am leaving/traveling to marry Bill*). It does not occur in the context of directionals in which the locative adverb is present such as *I am going to London* or even *I am going to London to marry Bill.*” (page 3)

(b) The change is made possible by the fact that there is an inference of futurity from purposives: if I am traveling in order to marry, the marriage will be in the future. In the absence of an overt directional phrase, futurity can become salient.

(c) The shift from purposive *be going (to…)* to auxiliary *be going to* involves reanalysis not only of the *be going to* phrase but of the verb following it. Thus [I am going [to marry Bill]] is rebracketed as [I am going to marry Bill]. It also involves a change of aspect from progressive aspect to "immediate future."

(d) The reanalysis is discoverable, that is, is manifest, only when the verb following *be going to* is incompatible with a purposive meaning, or at least unlikely in that context, for example, *I am going to like Bill, I am going to go to London.* In other words, the reanalysis is discoverable only because the contexts in which *be going to* can occur have been generalized, or analogized, to contexts that were unavailable before.

(e) Once the reanalysis has occurred, *be going to* can undergo changes typical of auxiliaries, such as phonological reduction. The reduction of the three morphemes *going to* into one (*gonna*) is possible only because there is no longer a phrasal bracket between *-ing* and *to.*

(f) The various stages of grammaticalization of *be going (to…)* coexist in Modern English, although the change originates in the fifteenth century or perhaps even earlier.

(g) The original purposive meaning continues to constrain the use of the auxiliary: *be gonna* is the future of intention, plan, or schedule. As an original aspectual, it can occur in constructions where a future formed with *will* cannot:

(4) a. If interest rates are going to climb, we’ll have to change our plans.
   b. *If interest rates will climb, we’ll have to change our plans.*

This property of persistence of meaning presumably derives in part from the fact that the older *be going (to…)* coexists with newer use, and hence there reinforcement of older meanings.
The main verb *go* is relatively general in meaning, that is, it expresses any kind of motion away from the speaker, including walking, meandering, running, riding, etc.

In the process of grammaticalization, some of the original relatively concrete meaning of *go* has been lost, specifically motion and directionality. However, some new meanings have also been added; these are more abstract and speaker-based meanings, specifically temporal meanings based in speaker time.

content item > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix

basket full of (eggs) > a cupful (of water) > hopeful

see examples from Burmese (in packet)

**Five mechanisms of semantic change (i.e., grammaticalization):**


1. metaphorical extension

(283) "a metaphorical shift from a more concrete to a more abstract domain, with preservation of some of the relational structure originally expressed"

metonymy - Rhetorical term: "the use of the name of an object or concept for that of another to which it is related or, of which it is a part, as "scepter" for "sovereignty," or "the bottle" for "strong drink," or "count heads (or noses)" for "count people."

Examples:

a. body-parts: “Notice that English uses body-part terms for spatial relationships in restricted contexts such as *the foot of the bed, the face of the cliff,* and *the face of the clock.* However, none of these phrases is grammaticalized or grammaticalizing at the moment.”

b. *must* page 284

“Another change in which metaphor appears to be operative as the mechanism is the development of an epistemic sense for the English modal *must.* …the obligation and
probability senses of *must* occur in mutually exclusive environments. The obligation sense occurs in future contexts such as (1) and (2), while the probability reading occurs in future contexts (3)-(6)."

(1) The letter must arrive sometime next week.
(2) He must call Edith right now.
(3) The letter must be in the mail.
(4) The letter much have been in the mail.
(5) He must have called three times while you were gone.
(6) He must be trying to call me right now.

'Since the two readings are not possible in the same context, the change to epistemic from the historically prior obligation sense cannot have occurred by inference. Metaphor is suspected because in the two readings *must* has a very similar meaning, but is applied in two different domains. In the agent-oriented domain the speakers asserts that the subject is obliged to do something, while in the epistemic domain the speakers asserts that the proposition is obliged to be true and thus probably is true.'

2. inference, or the conventionalization of implicature; context-induced reinterpretation

(266) "a gram in a certain context acquires a sense in addition to its original sense, and this second sense then gradually becomes the conventionalized meaning of the gram. This process is what we have referred to as change by inference or the conventionalization of implicature."

(285) "Note first that inference and implicature are two sides of the same coin: the speakers IMPLIES more than s/he asserts, and the hearer INFERS more than is asserted."

Examples:

a. *I hafta go now*
   *I hafta go now, but I'm not going to* (intention is already conventionalized) p. 287
   I wanna go now
   I wanna go now, but I can't

b. *When I get a raise, I'm gonna start looking for a house.* (first person intentions; first person intends to carry out something)
When Jack gets a raise, he's gonna start looking for a house.
(the speaker predicts that the third-person will carry out something) 288

c. anterior and perfects > presents with statives (page 288 Kanuri)
Perfect suffix nà

With dynamic predicates:
Mòdò isónà  ‘Modu has arrived.’
Shíà rúkónà.  ‘I have seen him.’

With ‘completive stative’ meaning:
Nòngóna.  ‘I know.’
Ríngónà.  ‘I am afraid.’
Gárgázónà.  ‘S/he is angry.’

3. generalization

289 "Generalization is the loss of specific features of meaning with the consequent expansion of appropriate contexts of use for a gram."

Examples:

a. can  290

mental ability
(i)  mental enabling conditions exist in an agent for the completion of the predicate situation

general ability
(ii)  enabling conditions exist in an agent for the completion of the predicate situation

root possibility
(iii)  enabling conditions exist for the completion of the predicate situation

290-291  Bybee 1988b  "many activities have both a mental and a physical component. While can would have originally been used with complement verbs such as read, spell, and paint, it might have gradually generalized to verbs that involve both mental and physical skills, such as sew, cook, build, or plant. Once it is used with these activities, its meaning would appear to refer to general ability, and it
could further be extended to use with verbs that suggest more physical than mental prowess, such as *swim* or *lift*.

b. **progressives - generalizations or what?**

291 "The most commonly used construction for the expression of progressive meaning is a phrase meaning 'to be doing', which originally has a locative meaning."

In many languages the resulting progressive has a purely temporal meaning. However, is this a metaphoric jump? No, any activity has both a spatial and a temporal location.

c. **go-futures - generalizations or what?**

spatial > spatial & temporal > temporal
— Where is he going? He's going to Nevada.
— *We’re going to Windsor to meet the king.* 292
— *We’re going to meet the king.*
— *Tomorrow, we’re going to meet the king.*
— *We’re going to solve the problem.*

4. **harmony**

293 "That is, modal elements such as British *should* are used in subordinate clauses where their modal force agrees with or harmonizes with the modal force of the main clause."

5. **absorption of contextual meaning**

Examples:

   a. *ne...pas*
   b. negative spreading in TB
   c. negative > yes/no question > question marker

6. **the creation of zero grams**
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