Constructions, grammatical status and morphologization

Gergana Popova

Goldsmiths, University of London

g.popova@gold.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper critically explores the question of what it means for a construction to be grammatical. The paper engages with some of the observations made in the grammaticalisation literature that elements in grammatical constructions undergo morphologization, and aims to show that grammatical status and morphologization need not be aligned. A number of parameters along which the grammatical status of a multiword expressions can vary are proposed and data illustrating different aspects of these parameters are discussed in detail. The data are used to argue that grammatical status is complex and multifaceted and linked not only to the formal properties of a construction, but also to its semantics and the relationship it has with other grammatical forms (e.g. inflected forms) in a given language.

1 Introduction

Historical linguistic studies suggest that today's grammatical items are yesterday's lexical ones, indeed a whole subfield of linguistics – the study of grammaticalization

1

22 – has devoted itself to the study of 'how lexical items and constructions come in

23 certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions or how grammatical

24 items develop new grammatical functions' (Traugott & Hopper, 2003, 1).[1] The

25 movement towards increasing grammatical function has been associated with

26 formal changes of items along the following grammaticalization cline (see (Traugott

27 & Hopper, 2003, 6f)):

28   (1)   content item > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix

29   Some of the elements on this cline, for example clitics, are notoriously

30 difficult to define (Spencer & Luís (2012a), Spencer & Luís (2012b), see also

31 remarks in Vincent & Börjars (2010)), nevertheless the cline reflects the assumption

32 that uncontroversial grammatical distinctions are likely to be encoded in (inflectional)

33 morphology. Similar assumptions are evident in the foregrounding of an understanding

34 of grammaticalization as a fusion of forms in Brinton & Traugott (2005). They

35 posit different levels of grammaticalization, such that periphrases are understood

36 to be least grammatical, next come semi-bound forms (i.e. function words and

37 clitics), and affixes are understood to represent the highest level of grammaticalization

38 ((Brinton & Traugott, 2005, 93)). There have been also voices of dissent.

39 Scholars like Joseph (2004), for example, have suggested that the cline in (1)

40 rather simplistically conflates form and function, or that 'becoming more grammatical'

41 is assumed to be the same as 'becoming more morphological'. Other authors

42 have pointed out that, when their distribution and function are taken into

43 account, some less morphological forms like clitics may be taken to be more

44 grammatical than more morphological forms like affixes (see remarks in (Askedal,

45 2008, 52f.) on the genitive in English and Mainland Scandinavian, for example).

Boye & Harder (2012) argue against using formal (phonological, semantic, morphosyntactic) criteria as definitional of grammatical status. More general understandings of grammaticalization are also signposted in Trousdale & Traugott (2010).

That grammatical functions can be performed by syntactic structures and not just words has been recognised for a long time, for example in traditional grammars by the inclusion of compound tenses and similar constructions in linguistic descriptions. More recently, there has been research into the status of such grammatical syntactic structures, or periphrases (see for example Brown et al. (2012) and references therein). And grammaticalisation studies have also given constructions considerable attention (see for example Traugott (2003), Trousdale (2012), and references therein).

The aim of this paper is to take a closer look at what it means for a construction to be 'grammatical'. The focus is on expressions that span more than one lexical item and the discussion is partially prompted by recent work on periphrasis, in which some scholars have claimed that periphrastic expressions can/should be seen on a par with morphological forms and integrated into the model of grammar in the same way as inflectional morphology. Given the prominence given to fusion of form, one particular concern of the paper is whether more tightly bound constructions (e.g. those containing clitics) are more grammatical than less tightly bound ones (e.g. where no such reduction has occurred). To keep formal changes of structures and their status in the overall linguistic system conceptually apart, I will refer to the formal changes reflected in (1) above as morphologization and to the process of becoming grammatical more generally as one of attaining grammatical status.

Although there are significant correlations between the structure of a multiword construction and its grammatical status, these correlations have important exceptions which show that we can't rely solely on syntagmatic tightness in our definition

3

of grammatical status, but need to give weight to other considerations.

The data covered in the paper come primarily from Slavic languages, and especially from Bulgarian and Macedonian, which have a rich cache of verbal constructions. Most of the ones mentioned here reflect tense distinctions, and in traditional descriptions many have been included in verbal paradigms alongside inflected forms. Like the inflected forms they are often grouped with, these constructions encode systematic abstract semantic contrasts in the grammar of the languages they are part of and are mutually interchangeable and exclusive with some inflected forms.

Trying to decouple morphologization from the process of attaining grammatical status requires some discussion of what it means to have such status. This is the subject of the next section, where the focus is on grammatical status in relation to multiword expressions.

2   Grammatical status

Arguing that constructions which are grammatical can be so to a lesser or higher degree and that their status is not linked in a very straighforward way to the morphologization of the elements within them requires some discussion of what it means to be 'grammatical'.

Most obviously, grammatical means 'not lexical'. In discussions of grammaticalization the presence of highly abstract semantics and the loss of referential content is considered to be the initial step towards grammatical status, as can be seen, for example, from the first stage in the following mapping of the route to it from (Heine, 2003, 579):

    i. desemanticization (or "bleaching", semantic reduction): loss in meaning content;

ii. extension (or context generalization): use in new contexts;

iii. decategorialization: loss in morphosyntactic properties characteristic of the source forms, including the loss of independent word status (cliticization, affixation);

iv. erosion (or "phonetic reduction"), that is, loss in phonetic substance.

The distinction between lexical and grammatical meaning is, of course, fundamental and related to other distinctions like that between inflection and derivation. It is more easily applicable to a single element (affix or word) than to a complex construction. Thus, for example, the verb *have* is lexical in the sentence *I have a dog* where it refers to ownership, but grammatical in the perfect construction in *I have walked the dog*.[2] It is more difficult to say in what way a construction as a whole is grammatical, rather than lexical. Intuitively, the construction *have walked* and the verb *walk* in, for example, *I walk the dog every day*, have an identical lexical meaning and differ only with respect to their grammatical meaning, much like the latter example of *walk* and the form *walked* in *He walked the dog* do. This semantic bleaching is linked to a lexical item becoming a function word in syntactic terms and a biclausal structure becoming a monoclausal one. (Harris & Campbell, 1995, 172ff.) in their discussion of reanalysis of a biclausal structure (with two lexical verbs) to a monoclausal one (with one lexical and one function verb) posit that the reanalysis itself is abrupt.[3] The transition from a bi- to monoclausal structure in some sense paves the way for a form to be grammatical, i.e. for a syntactic structure to be able to behave as a word-form of a lexeme, and paves the way for

---

[2]For a recent proposal on how to determine the grammatical status of a lexical element that relies not on formal properties like clitichood, or phonological reduction, see Boye & Harder (2012).

[3]For further remarks on reanalysis in the context of grammaticalization and a range of views, see for example Lehmann (2004), Traugott (2011) and references therein.

morphologization. For example, the transition from lexical to functional with the concomitant loss of lexical meaning is seen by Dahl (2004) to be a factor that makes phonological reduction possible. Phonological reduction would lead to morphologization (cliticization/affixation) which is seen as the hallmark of grammatical status in grammaticalisation studies (stage iii above). Phonological reduction, however, happens gradually, so if we accept an abrupt transition from a biclausal to monoclausal (grammatical) construction, we need to accept constructions which are grammatical but not morphologized. There may also a typological dimension to this, in the sense that morphologization may bear a different relationship to grammatical status in languages with different typology, see remarks and references in Wiemer (2014). The discussion in Section 3 aims to show that constructions with an equivalent status in the grammar have morphologized to a different degree.

Being grammatical can also be understood to mean being an exponent of a grammatical feature. The English construction of *have* and a past participle form of a lexical verb illustrated above can be said to be an exponent of a value of the grammatical feature of aspect in English. It isn't easy to put the intuition behind the notion of feature in more precise terms. An explicit answer to the question of when a feature should be introduced in the description of a particular language has been given most systematically in publications like Corbett (2011), Corbett (2012); see also references therein. Implicit in these publications, as well as the literature on grammaticalisation, is the assumption that grammatical features are relevant to morphological, or inflected forms. It is with inflected forms that the benefit of employing a notion like grammatical feature or value is most obvious. Features can help us express generalisations about the relationship between forms like *walk* and *walked*. Features are also most obviously needed when they allow for an economical statement of the

6

co-occurrence of inflected forms in agreement, for example, or allow us to state relations of government between two or more linguistic expressions, or explain different patterns of syncretism (see detailed justifications of features in Corbett (2012)). Agreement and government are not immediately applicable to constructions in their entirety. In some of the situations described below, however, constructions have been assumed to be exponents of grammatical features and their values.

Grammatical constructions can be considered to display morphological characteristics in a different sense from the morphologization processes described above. They can be considered to be more morphological (and less syntactic) when they display some kind of non-compositionality. For example, the meaning 'perfect' in the *have* + past participle construction in English cannot be pinned onto *have* only, it depends on the combination of *have* with a past participle of a verb (see discussions in Börjars et al. (1997), Sadler & Spencer (2001), Ackerman & Stump (2004), Spencer (2012)). In this sense the construction as a whole can be considered to be the exponent of a grammatical feature (e.g. perfect) that none of its elements possesses. Dahl (2004) also posits a link between featurization, in morphology, and various break-downs of the one to one correspondence between form and meaning. However, non-compositionality, although more often a property of complex words than it is of syntactic structures, is not necessarily the same as grammatical status. Indeed, in a discussion of what the 'canonical'[4] exponence of a grammatical feature should look like in inflection, Corbett (2011) puts forward the transparent one-to-one correspondence between form and function as one parameter. The criterion of non-compositionality has also been refined to take into account headedness in relation to work on

---

[4]Canonical in this sense is a term from canonical typology, which seeks to describe variation in phenomena by adopting the logical end point of their definition and mapping out existing phenomena outwards from that definition (see Corbett (2007), Corbett (2011) and others).

periphrasis in, for instance, (Bonami & Samvellian, 2015, 375).

A different sense in which grammatical constructions can be seen to be 'morphological' lies within their relationship with inflected forms in languages where both are present. Grammatical constructions can be considered equivalent to (inflected) word-forms. Such understanding of grammatical constructions was clearly voiced as early as the middle of the last century in Smirnickij (1956) and Smirnickij (1959).The clearest case is the one where syntactic structures fill in cells in otherwise morphological paradigms[5] of inflected forms (see again Börjars et al. (1997), Sadler & Spencer (2001), Ackerman & Stump (2004) and also Brown et al. (2012)). Sometimes the relationship between grammatical constructions and inflected forms is less tight, for example the perfect construction in English is semantically related to other tense/aspect forms in the language, some of which are inflected. In this sense the constructions that will be discussed in the next section are all grammatical. The idea that some multiword constructions are essentially word-forms and should be modelled as such has become prominent in work on periphrasis, especially in the context of assumptions about morphology that lead to a formal morphological model which is different from the syntactic one. Periphrasis, understood in this way, occupies the middle ground between morphology and syntax. For very interesting discussions of periphrasis, overlapping to an extent with the current one, see for instance Bonami (2015), Bonami & Samvellian (2015).

Another criterion for grammatical status is the lexical generality of a construction, that is whether it can admit in the 'lexical verb' slot all the lexemes in a relevant class or not, cf. the restrictions on the use of the *have*-perfect in Bulgarian with its generality in Macedonian discussed in the previous sections.[6]

---

[5]Throughout I adopt the understanding of paradigm which sees it as a set of cells defined by the cross-classification of features in a language, i.e. the set of logically possible grammatical distinctions for a language.

[6]As pointed out by one anonymous reviewer, such statements are not without problems.

Generality is also singled out as an important element in being grammatical with respect to constructions in Trousdale (2012). In this respect grammatical constructions are akin to inflection. Corbett (2011) defines consistent exponence across the relevant part of speech as one of the criteria associated with canonical inflectional morphosyntactic features. Constructions rarely start out having lexical generality. They become more general as a result of what (Dahl, 2004, 120f), for example, calls pattern spread, or the gradually increased ability of a pattern to be used in situations where it was previously not possible. This generality is linked to Stage (ii) in the grammaticalisation process described by (Heine, 2003, 579) above.

For inflected forms that express grammatical features grammatical status has been also linked to obligatoriness. Once a distinction attains grammatical status to a high degree, it becomes not just something available to its speakers, but something speakers must express. An English noun cannot be used in a particular context without expressing number (see remarks on this aspect of featurization in Dahl (2004)). A verb in an English main clause has to be tensed. Features can have a number of usually mutually exclusive values (nouns can be singular or plural in English, verbs can be past and non-past). If we assume that one of the values of an obligatory feature is coded as a multiword expression, then the obligatoriness of the feature will apply to that multiword expression. It is important to point out, however, that constructions comprise at least some inflected forms, so for example the English perfect construction illustrated above requires that the function verb *have* be inflected in the present tense (and whatever person/number values are required by agreement). In this sense obligatoriness is more difficult to apply directly to constructions. In certain

---

Different grammatical categories display greater or lesser interaction with the lexical semantics of stems, e.g. aspect interacts with stem semantics more than tense, even though in some sense both are relevant to events and therefore verbs.

contexts speakers of English are required by the grammar of their language to use a perfect form of the verb – in these contexts they need to use a construction in which the function verb is in the present tense.

Another characteristic of attainment of grammatical status to a high degree is paradigmatic organisation. Once grammatical distinctions have become systematic, and especially when more than one value becomes possible for a number of grammatical features, the structures that express these features (very often inflected forms) can be organised in paradigms.

Paradigmatic organisation has been associated mostly with inflectional morphology. As we will see in later sections, however, and as has been argued already with respect to some of the data I mention here, paradigmatic organisation is possible not just for morphological, but also for syntactic forms (see Spencer (2003), Popova & Spencer (2013)). Since the aim here is to show that grammatical status and morphologization should not be conflated, Section 4 will demonstrate that forms with different degrees of morphologization can exhibit paradigmatic organisation.

To sum up, the following are important in defining the preconditions that need to be present for a given linguistic expression to have a high degree of grammatical status:

1. A linguistic form is grammatical if it expresses an abstract grammatical distinction; such a form will most often be in opposition to other forms with which it shares lexical meaning, but differs in grammatical meaning;

2. A linguistic form with a high grammatical status admits the whole lexical class it is relevant to;

3. The distinction that is expressed by a linguistic form with a high grammatical status is obligatory;

10

4. A grammatical linguistic form may be in a paradigmatic organisation with a small set of other forms.

These parameters are orthogonal to each other and allow linguistic expressions to be more or less grammatical in certain respects. They are related to morphologization, in that losing lexical meaning and assuming functional status are preconditions for morphologization, but degrees of grammatical status and degrees of morphologization do not necessarily correlate. To the extent that morphologization is not considered a reliable indicator of grammatical status, this paper adopts a position similar to the one adopted, for example, in Boye & Harder (2012). However, when it comes to being grammatical to a different degree, Boye & Harder (2012) fall back onto the traditional formal criteria of grammaticalization.

The next section will discuss a multiword construction that has different grammatical status in two closely related languages, as well as exhibiting different degrees of morphologization. The section after that will illustrate further the point that cliticisation and affixation are symptomatic of grammatical status, but are not inherent elements of it. Section 5 will discuss paradigmaticity. Section 6 will return to the issue of meaning. Section 7 will point out some of the complex issues that arise from considering the relationship between related inflected and multiword expressions.

3 Different grammatical status, different morphosyntactic properties

This section will use as illustration the so-called *have*-construction, which can be found in Macedonian, Bulgarian and other Slavic languages. Formally, it is cognate to constructions like the perfect construction in English (e.g. *I have written a letter*). It is composed of the verb HAVE and a past passive participle

11

of the lexical verb and has accrued meanings of persistent result of a past act which are reminiscent of the English perfect. Both Macedonian and Bulgarian (but not the other Slavic languages where the *have*-construction is found, e.g. Czech) do in fact have a widely recognised perfect construction based on the verb BE. The *have*-construction is often explicitly or implicitly compared to the *be*-perfect. To enable the comparison, I first briefly illustrate the *be*-perfect construction using Bulgarian data in (2) below:

(2)   *Az săm*   *čela*   *tazi kniga.*
     I   be.1SG.PRS read.LPTCP.SG.F this book

     'I have read this book.'

The *be*-perfect is composed of an inflected present tense form of the auxiliary BE and a past participle (often called the *l*-participle because of the suffix *-l* added to the aorist verbal stem).[7] Some of the properties of the elements that are part of the *be*-perfect will be explored in the next section. What is important to say here is that the construction is general (I am not aware of restrictions on the verbs that can appear in a *be*-perfect tense), the meaning associated with it is abstract and predictable (although the construction is polysemous, see for example the description in (Nicolova, 2008, 294-300)).

In terms of these properties the *be*-perfect construction can be contrasted to the *have*-construction which to a great extent overlaps with it semantically. The *have*-construction is composed of the inflected present tense form of the verb *have* and the past passive participle of the main verb.

---

[7]The *l*-participle is named after the affix with which it is derived and has been glossed as LPTCP in examples throughout. Similarly, the past passive participle is derived most often with the suffix *-n*, so I have glossed it as the *n*-participle or NPTCP. The other abbreviations used in the glosses are as follows: 1/2/3 – first/second/third person, ACC – accusative, CL – clitic, DAT – dative, DEF – definite, F – feminine, FUT – future, IPFV – imperfective, M – masculine, N – neuter, PFV – perfective, PL – plural, PRS – present, PST – past, REFL – reflexive, SG – singular, Q – question

Some uses of the *have*-construction are illustrated in (3) below with Bulgarian examples, adapted from (Xaralampiev, 2001, 144). He points out that despite similarities to compound tense constructions, the *have*-construction is not usually included amongst them.

(3)　a.　*Toj ima　　　napisani　　osem raboti.*
　　　　he　have.3SG.PRS write.NPTCP.PL eight work.PL
　　　　'He has written eight projects'.

　　　b.　*Az imam　　vzeti　　　njakolko izpita.*
　　　　I　have.1SG.PRS take.NPTCP.PL a_few　　exam.PL
　　　　'I have taken (successfully) a few exams' or
　　　　'I have a few exams that are successfully taken'.

　　　c.　*Te　imat　　săzdaden　　krăžok po literatura.*
　　　　they have.3PL.PRS created.NPTCP.M club.M in literature
　　　　'They had created a literature club'. or
　　　　'They had a literature club they had created'.

　　　d.　*Imame　　objaven　　　konkurs.*
　　　　have.1PL.PRS announce.NPTCP.SG.M competition.SG.M
　　　　We had announced a competition. (We had a competition announced).

Synchronic data suggest that this construction has attained different levels of grammatical status in different varieties of the language. According to (Xaralampiev, 2001, 144), the *have*-construction is used more widely in some non-standard dialects (e.g. south-western and Thracian dialects) than in the standard variety; he also points out that in these varieties the *have*-construction is used as synonymous to the perfect *be*-construction ((Xaralampiev, 2001, 144)).

An early discussion of this construction in Bulgarian can be found in Georgiev (1976), who argues that it is in the process of becoming a tense in Bulgarian, even though it has not yet established itself as such. In support of his position (Georgiev, 1976, 299f.) points out that the verb *have* has undergone semantic

13

<superscript>320</superscript> bleaching. In other words, the construction can be used to refer to things which

<superscript>321</superscript> are not literally 'owned', which he illustrates with the example (4) below:

<superscript>322</superscript> (4) *Imam poračani văglišta, no ošte ne sa*
have.1SG.PRS ordered.NPTCP.PL coal.PL but yet not arrived
<superscript>323</superscript> *pristignali.*

<superscript>324</superscript> 'I have ordered coal, but it hasn't arrived yet'.

<superscript>325</superscript> The source of the *have*-construction, according to Georgiev (1976), are structures

<superscript>326</superscript> where the *n*-participle is used as an object complement or in a clause post-modifying

<superscript>327</superscript> an object. As this example shows, at some point the participle *poračani* 'ordered'

<superscript>328</superscript> has shifted from its postnominal modifier position to a position adjacent to the

<superscript>329</superscript> verb, where it could potentially be reanalysed as part of a monoclausal structure

<superscript>330</superscript> with an auxiliary and a lexical verb. The *n*-participle, however, still agrees with

<superscript>331</superscript> the object, whilst the verb *have* itself agrees with the sentential subject. Details

<superscript>332</superscript> of a similar chain of events in English can be found in (Harris & Campbell, 1995,

<superscript>333</superscript> 172ff.). In an analysis of this construction using mainly Polish data (Migdalski,

<superscript>334</superscript> 2006, 153ff) proposes that the participle and the object form a small clause.

<superscript>335</superscript> In addition to these formal properties that signal incomplete grammaticalization,

<superscript>336</superscript> Georgiev (1976) himself recognises that there are perhaps even more important

<superscript>337</superscript> restrictions on the *have*-construction to do with its generality. Unlike the

<superscript>338</superscript> *be*-perfect tense construction, it is restricted to transitive (cf. 5a and 5b) and

<superscript>339</superscript> non-stative (cf. 6a and 6b) verbs.

<superscript>340</superscript> (5) a. *Tja e boleduvala mnogo kato dete.*
she be.3SG.PRS be_ill.LPTCP.SG.F a_lot as   child
<superscript>341</superscript> 'She has been ill a lot as a child.'

<superscript>342</superscript> b. **Tja ima boleduvano mnogo kato dete.*
she have.3SG.PRS be_ill.NPTCP.SG.N a_lot as   child
<superscript>343</superscript> (intended) 'She has been ill a lot as a child'

(6) a. *Toj e   običal   pet ženi.*
he   be.3SG love.LPTCP.M.SG five women

'He has loved five women'.

  b. **Toj ima   običani   pet ženi.*
he   have.3SG.PRS love.NPTCP.PL five women

(intended) 'He has loved five women'

The *have*-construction is also more acceptable with durative resulting states,
e.g. compare (7a) with (7b):

(7) a. *Toj ima   spečeleni   šest mača*
he   have.3SG.PRS won.NPTCP.PL five matches

'He has won five matches'.

  b. *?Toj ima   ritnati   pet topki*
he   have.3SG.PRS kick.NPTCP.PL five balls

(intended) 'He has kicked five balls'.

According to Mirčev (1976) the *have*-construction has demonstrated a considerable
stability in its long history in the language, which leads him to argue that
it isn't, in fact, in the process of becoming a tense. Its lack of generality
and the existence of an alternative frequent and general construction with the
same meaning certainly seem to diminish the degree to which it has attained
grammatical status. The relatively less clear grammatical status appears to
correlate with a relatively low degree of morphologization: the participle hasn't
lost its agreement with the object, the auxiliary hasn't lost its word status.

By contrast with the Bulgarian examples we have seen so far, the cognate
have-construction in Macedonian has attained grammatical status to a very high
degree. In this language a higher degree of generality correlates with a slightly
different set of formal properties.[8] In Macedonian, it would seem, there is no
reason not to include the *have*-construction amongst the compound tenses in

---

[8]According to Migdalski (2006) Kashubian is the only other Slavic language where this
construction is completely grammaticalized.

₃₆₇ the language. The construction is mostly synonymous to the *be*-perfect which

₃₆₈ also exists in Macedonian.

₃₆₉   Examples (8a) and (8b) are adapted from (Kramer, 2003, 326), where further

₃₇₀ elaboration is available.

₃₇₁ (8) a. *Ne sum   go   gledal   ovoj film*
          not be.1SG.PRS 3SG.ACC.M seen.LPTCP.M that film

₃₇₂   'I haven't seen that film'.

₃₇₃ b. *Go   nemam   gledano   ovoj film*
          SG.ACC.M not.have.PRS.1SG seen.NPTCP.SG.N that film

₃₇₄   'I haven't seen that film'

₃₇₅   The *have*-perfect construction can also be used, as highlighted by Migdalski

₃₇₆ (2006), with unaccusative, ergative, transitive predicates, with human and non-human

₃₇₇ or inanimate subjects. Some examples adapted from (Migdalski, 2006, 133ff) are

₃₇₈ shown below, see also references therein. On the generality of the Macedonian

₃₇₉ perfect see also Elliott (2004). Interesting dialectal variations are reported in

₃₈₀ (Tomič, 2012, 322-326).

₃₈₁ (9) a. *Gostite imaat   dojdeno*
          guests have.3PL arrive.NPTCP.SG.N

₃₈₂   'The guests have arrived'

₃₈₃ b. *Goce Delčev ima   spieno   tuka*
          Goce Delčev have.3SG.PRS sleep.NPTCP.3SG here

₃₈₄ c. *Imam   dobieno   edno pismo do sega od*
          have.1SG.PRS receive.NPTCP.SG.N one   letter till now from

₃₈₅   *Violeta*
          Violeta

₃₈₆   'Up till now I have received one letter from Violeta'

₃₈₇ d. *Mačkata go   ima   ispieno mlekoto*
          cat   SG.ACC.N have.3SG.N milk

₃₈₈   'The cat has drunk the milk'.

₃₈₉ e. *Brodot se   ima   udreno   vo karpite*
          ship   REFL have.3SG.PRS hit.NPTCP.SG.N in rocks

‘The ship hit rocks’.

As the above examples also show, the generality of the Macedonian *have*-construction goes hand in hand with some important structural characteristics. Whereas in Bulgarian (and other Slavic languages) the *n*-participle agrees with the object, Macedonian uses an invariant (non-agreeing) participle.[9] To reflect this, Migdalski (2006) assigns to the grammaticalized Macedonian construction a distinct syntactic structure, where a small clause is replaced by a participial phrase in which the participle and the object are not in a predicative relationship, but instead the participle selects the object as a complement.

Importantly, whereas in Macedonian the verb *have* and the participle share the same agent, in Bulgarian (and other Slavic languages) the participle can have a different agent, crucially realized as an oblique, as is clear in (10) below:[10]

(10) *Imam   podareni   dva časovnika ot Viktor.*
      have.1SG.PRS gift.NPTCP.PL two watches   by Viktor

‘I have two watches gifted (to me) by Viktor’.

In the case of the *have*-construction we can see clear correlations between form and function. Indeed, some authors consider the structure of the construction to be crucial. Elliott (2004), for example, compares the properties of the *have*-construction in Macedonian and in the Erkeč dialect of Bulgarian (where the construction has similar properties to its cognate in the standard dialect), and concludes that 'The structure of the verb phrase is by far the crucial feature in determining that the Erkeč construction is not a possessive present perfect'.

---

[9]Note, however, that according to (Tomič, 2012, 325) the west-central Kičevo dialect has preserved the older *have*-perfect forms with inflecting passive participles.

[10]An alternative explanation, however, would be that the new possibly monoclausal construction has not replaced completely the older, biclausal structure. Instead, they continue to exist side by side. This, I believe, would be in the spirit of proposals made by Harris & Campbell (1995).

17

To conclude, in both Bulgarian and Macedonian the *have*-construction has undergone some important structural changes. In Macedonian the construction has undergone the crucial reanalysis of a biclausal structure into a monoclausal one (a change described cross-linguistically by Harris & Campbell (1995)). This change is decisive for acquiring grammatical status, as it allows one of the verbs to become an auxiliary that expresses grammatical rather than lexical meaning. In Bulgarian the evidence that the reanalyis has taken place is less clear, as there is still agreement between the participle and the nominal form it used to modify, but there is evidence that the verb 'have' is losing the meaning of 'ownership'. Notably, the construction has different generality in the two languages: in Bulgarian it is restricted to fewer types of verbs than in Macedonian. This lack of generality corresponds to some syntactic structural differences between the cognate constructions in the two languages. Neither of the two languages exhibits phonological reduction of the auxiliary. However, in both languages the auxiliary and the participial form exhibit a strong tendency to appear adjacent.[11]

The next section aims to discuss constructions where the degree of grammatical status does not correlate very well with different morphosyntactic properties.

---

[11]The discussion here focused on Slavic data. However, as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, interesting variations in structural properties that do not correlate with different degrees of grammatical status can be found with *have*-auxiliary constructions in Romance languages, for example Italian. In Italian, the past participle in constructions with the *have* auxiliary can agree or not with the object depending on structural factors like whether the object is a clitic pronoun. Crucially, the absence or presence of agreement is not linked to a difference in function or meaning, as pointed out in Maiden & Robustelli (2000).

4 Equal grammatical status, different morphosyntactic properties

Bulgarian can be used again as a source of data that shows that grammatical status and morphologization do not correlate very well. The language has a number of constructions that are associated traditionally with the morphosemantic feature of tense (the language also has inflected tense forms). One of them – the perfect tense construction – was illustrated already in (2) above. By way of both a reminder and an extension, in (11) below the *be*-perfect construction of the verb 'give' is repeated, this time represented with the different person/number forms (and with the pronouns in brackets):

(11)

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
1	(az) săm dal/-a/-o	(nie) sme dali
2	(ti) si dal/-a/-o	(vie) ste dali
3	(toj/tja/to) e dal/-a/-o	(te) sa dali

As the reader will remember, the perfect tense comprises a present tense form of the verb *săm* 'be' inflected for the corresponding person and number and the *l*-participle of the lexical verb. The participle reflects number and (in the singular only) gender distinctions.

The present tense form of the verb *săm* 'be' behaves like a clitic and enters the clitic cluster: the cluster comprises auxiliaries and pronominals and takes the form in (12) (for further details, see (Avgustinova, 1994), (Spencer & Luís, 2012b, 59-64) and references therein):

(12) Bulgarian clitic cluster

Neg ⇒ Fut ⇒ Aux ⇒ Dat ⇒ Acc ⇒ 3sgPrsAux

Generally, clitics precede the verb unless this would place them in clause-initial position.[12] Though not absolute, this generalization is true of *săm*.[13] (13a) below shows a ditransitive verb in the perfect tense with full NPs, whereas in (13b) the full NPs are replaced with pronominal clitics. (13c) and (13d) demonstrate that clitics are not allowed in sentence initial position and move after the verb to avoid being placed there,[14] and (13e) demonstrates the position in the cluster of the verb 'be' in the 3SG.

(13) a. *Az săm   dala   statiite   na studenta.*
        I   be.1SG.PRS give.LPTCP.F papers.DEF to student.M.DEF
        'I have given the papers to the student.'

     b. *Az săm   mu   gi   dala.*
        I   be.1SG.PRS 3SG.DAT.M 3PL.ACC give.LPTCP.F
        'I have given them to him.'

     c. **Săm   mu   gi   dala.*
        be.1SG.PRS 3SG.DAT.M 3PL.ACC give.LPTCP.F
        '(intended)(I) have given them to him.'

     d. *Dala   săm   mu   gi.*
        give.PTCP.F be.1SG.PRS cl.3SG.DAT.M cl.3PL.ACC
        '(I) have given them to him.'

     e. *Dala   mu   gi   e.*
        give.PTCP.F cl.3SG.DAT.M cl.3PL.ACC be.3SG.PRS
        '(She) has given them to him.'

The *be*-perfect is clearly a grammatical construction, in the terms in which this is often defined in the literature on grammaticalization. Within the construction, one element has no lexical meaning and its contribution is instead abstract and similar to meanings linked to inflectional morphology elsewhere in the language. The construction has become, as this is often described in traditional descriptive

---

[12]Note that Bulgarian is a pro-drop language.

[13]This is the case whether *săm* is an auxiliary or a copula.

[14]There are exceptions – I will discuss one of them shortly.

grammars, the 'perfect tense form' of the lexical verb. As we will expect from perfect tense forms, all verbs have them. In other words, the construction has achieved full generality. In the language where it is found it is in opposition to inflected forms, i.e. the construction acts like one of the tense forms of the verb.

In another Bulgarian tense construction – the pluperfect – the auxiliary verb BE appears again, but this time in the past (imperfect) tense and with a different syntactic behaviour. The pluperfect construction is illustrated in (14), and the whole paradigm is shown in (15) below.

(14) *Predi tova bjax   dala   statiite   na studenta.*
before that be.1SG.PST give.LPTCP.SG.F papers.DEF to student.M.DEF
'Before that (I) had given the papers to the student'.

(15) | | SINGULAR | PLURAL |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | az bjax dal/-a/-o | nie bjaxme dali |
| 2 | ti beše dal/-a/-o | vie bjaxte dali |
| 3 | toj/tja/to beše dal/-a/-o | te bjaxa dali |

The auxiliary *bjax* 'be.PST' is not a clitic and does not enter the clitic cluster. Instead, it can host the cluster. For example, in (16a) below, the cluster comes to the left of the auxiliary, whereas in (16b) it comes to the left of the participle (see also (Avgustinova, 1994, 70f), (Nicolova, 2008, 301f) (Spencer & Luís, 2012b, 62)).

(16) a. *Az mu   gi   bjax   dala*
I   3SG.DAT.M PL.ACC be.1SG.PST give.LPTCP.SG.F
'I had given them to him'.

b. *Bjax   mu   gi   dala.*
be.1SG.PST 3SG.DAT.M 3PL.ACC give.PTCP.SG.F
'(I) had given them to him'.

The data above show that the present tense and the past tense 'be' auxiliary have different morphosyntactic status: one of them has clitic-like properties,

21

whereas the other doesn't. Even though one of the auxiliaries is more morphologized than the other, the two constructions are equally grammatical in the sense discussed in the beginning of the paper. Both constructions are available with the whole class of verbs, that is, the constructions have a similar level of lexical generality. Both constructions express morphosemantic distinctions and the distinctions are of a similar level of abstractness. In traditional descriptions of the language both constructions are discussed as part of the tense verbal paradigm. The only reason we may wish to assume that one of these constructions is 'more grammatical' than the other is the precise fact that the functional element in one, but not the other, is a clitic.

So far I have argued that in constructions that appear to be equally 'grammatical' functional elements can have a different morphosyntactic status – some are clitics, and some are function words. However, entities subsumed under the label of 'clitic' often themselves have different properties (see Spencer & Luís (2012b)). By way of a brief illustration, I present the future tense construction in Bulgarian. Future tenses in Bulgarian and Macedonian will be discussed in the next section as well. The forms (in this case of the verb DAM 'give') associated with the future tense construction are shown in (17) below:

(17)

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
1	šte dam	šte dadem
2	šte dadeš	šte dadete
3	šte dade	šte dadat

The future tense construction comprises an invariant element and a present tense form of the lexical verb inflected for person and number (see also 18a). The invariant element is, historically, a 3SG present tense form of the verb *šta* 'want'. No forms can intervene between *šte* and the main verb, not even adverbials (18b), apart from clitics in the clitic cluster (18c). *Šte* itself, however,

22

unlike the present 'be' auxiliary discussed earlier, can appear in absolute clause

initial position (as 18c illustrates). Despite this, *šte* is not a fully accented word,

as is clear from the fact that the question particle *li* cannot follow it directly (see

18d – having a fully accented element to the left is a condition on the placement

of *li*),[15] but must follow *šte* and the lexical verb (18e).

(18) a. *Az šte dam statiite na studenta.*
       I FUT give.1SG.PRS articles.DEF to student.M.DEF

      'I will give the articles to the student'

     b. **Az šte skoro dam statiite na studenta.*
        I FUT soon give.1SG.PRS articles.DEF to student.M.DEF

      '(intended) I will soon give the articles to the student.'

     c. *Šte mu gi dam.*
        FUT 3SG.DAT.M 3PL.ACC give.1SG.PRS

      '(I) will give him them'

     d. **Šte li dam statiite na studenta?*
        FUT Q give.1SG.PRS articles.DEF to student.M.DEF

      '(intended) Will (I) give the articles to the student'

     e. *Šte dam li statiite na studenta?*
        FUT give.1SG.PRS Q articles.DEF to student.M.DEF

      'Will (I) give the articles to the student?'

To sum up, the auxiliaries in tense constructions have varied behaviours.[16]

Some of them display non-clitic behaviour and some are clitics, but can have

different properties. This is not surprising in itself. That similar (periphrastic)

constructions can exhibit different structural properties is also noted, for example,

in Bonami & Webelhuth (2013). What I wish to emphasise here is that this

---

[15]A detailed description of li is available in (Spencer & Luís, 2012b, 82f)

[16]The aim here isn't to present an analysis that will account for the different properties of
these constructions. For some accounts, please refer to sources like Tomič (2004), Migdalski
(2006), Franks (2008) and references therein.

538 varied morphosyntactic behaviour does not appear to correlate with differences

539 in grammatical status, at least not in the sense discussed earlier.

5   Paradigmatic organization

541 The preceding section aimed to show that constructions with function words and

542 constructions where the functional element appears in different incarnations of

543 'clitichood' are equally general and abstract.

544   Grammatical constructions can also intersect, or enter into oppositions with

545 various inflectional forms in a given language. One such interaction with inflection

546 has been singled out in the literature as being an exceptionally clear case of a

547 grammatical construction that could or should be awarded a 'morphological'

548 status (in the sense of being integrated in the morphological system of the

549 language). This special case is the one where a grammatical construction

550 fills in a gap in an otherwise inflectional paradigm (the term *periphrasis* is

551 used most frequently in this case). A very well known example comes from

552 Russian, where present tense forms from the morphological point of view have

553 been reinterpreted as future forms, so that from a point of view of how the

554 language works synchronically verbs in the perfective have inflected future tense

555 forms, whereas verbs in the imperfective have periphrastic futures (in bold in

556 the examples that follow). This reinterpretation has left perfective verbs with

557 no present tense forms.[17] This is illustrated with the verb 'give' in (19) below:

---

[17]With thanks to an anonymous reviewer for pointing out that it is important to make the distinction between the formal morphology and the function to which this morphology has been put in the language.

24

(19) | | Perfective | Imperfective |

	Perfective	Imperfective
Infinitive	*dat'*	*davat'*
Present (1SG)	—	*daju*
Future (1SG)	*dam*	**budu davat'**

The analysis of such essentially syntactic expressions that appear in otherwise inflected paradigms is subject to debates. But a convincing case has been made that such syntactic constructions, which are functionally equivalent to inflected forms, should be seen to be part of the morphological paradigm. They fill in 'cells' in the paradigm, in the sense that they express morphosyntactic or morphosemantic features that are otherwise expressed by inflected forms. Other aspects of such constructions have also been seen to be crucial, for example whether any features expressed can be pinned onto one of the elements of the construction, or whether they are distributed across the construction in a non-compositional manner (see particularly Ackerman & Stump (2004)).[18] As (Dahl, 2004, 196) points out, if we analyse inflected forms within a Word-and-Paradigm model and we try to obtain a unified characterization of paradigms that contain periphrases, we need to analyse periphrases themselves in terms of abstract features. A consequence of this could be a separation of the analysis in terms of abstract features from the sequential morphemic analysis on the level of the (morphological) word and the necessity to identify features even before functional forms have been integrated into words (that is have undergone suffixation).[19]

It is important to highlight the fact that analyses of periphrastic expressions depend to a large extent on a particular understanding of the notion 'paradigm'.

---

[18] Analyses of such cases and the debates surrounding them can be found in Sadler & Spencer (2001), Spencer (2001), Spencer (2003), Ackerman & Stump (2004), Kiparsky (2004), Popova (2010) Brown et al. (2012), Popova & Spencer (2013) and references therein.

[19] As an anonymous reviewer points out, this concerns the perfective future in Russian as well. As s/he points out, the reinterpretation of the present form as future also cannot be given a straightforward grammaticalization account.

If paradigm is taken to mean 'set of inflected forms', then of course the kind of periphrase discussed above would be excluded from it simply by virtue of not being a single inflected form. If we wish to include periphrasis as part of paradigms, we have to understand a 'paradigm' as being a set of abstract cells, defined by morphosyntactic/ morphosemantic features and their intersections. In other words, since Russian has a present and a future tense and a perfective and an imperfective aspect and these seem to intersect, i.e. we have forms like the future perfective, we are justified in expecting a future imperfective form. And we do find it, though it is not a single inflected verb form.

Once we allow a cell in an inflected paradigm to be filled in by a non-inflected form, we could make an additional step and allow the whole paradigm to be filled by non-inflected forms (on a paradigmatic view of some grammatical constructions see Spencer (2003), and also Brown et al. (2012)). One reason for doing so could be simply that constructions appear in semantic opposition to inflected forms. A more fundamental argument could be made that certain constructions exhibit features of paradigmatic organization (multiple or zero exponence, cumulation, extended exponence, etc.). This point is made particularly clearly in Spencer (2001) and Spencer (2003). These phenomena have been given as examples of maturation of grammatical systems ((Dahl, 2004, 184f)). Whilst a thorough investigation of paradigmatic phenomena in constructional paradigms is beyond the scope of this paper, what I want to show in what follows is that grammatical constructions with different composition and with different formal properties can enter into paradigmatic oppositions, i.e. that they exhibit something akin to suppletion of inflected forms.

I will use Bulgarian data again, and will focus the attention on the future tense forms of the verb 'give' discussed before in (17), repeated in (20) for convenience:

(20) 1 šte dam   šte dadem

      2 šte dadeš   šte dadete

      3 šte dade   šte dadat

What is of interest here are the negated equivalents of these forms, shown in (21) below:

(21) Negated future with *ne*   Negated future with *njama*

	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
1	*ne šte dam*	*ne šte dadem*	*njama da dam*	*njama da dadem*
2	*ne šte dadeš*	*ne šte dadete*	*njama da dadeš*	*njama da dadete*
3	*ne šte dade*	*ne šte dadat*	*njama da dade*	*njama da dadat*

There are two sets of negated forms for the future tense: one set (on the left-hand side of the table above) contains the addition of the expected negative particle *ne* to the construction we showed in (20), the other (shown on the right-hand side) is based on a different auxiliary verb altogether, namely the negative form of the verb *imam* 'have'. The data in (21) show that we can have more than one construction expressing the same grammatical meaning, or competing for the same paradigmatic slot. That more than one form might express the same meaning or compete for the same paradigmatic niche is not a new observation (see discussion in the context of grammatical maturation in (Dahl, 2004, 120, 128f), for example, or, with reference to Bulgarian data in Manova (2006)). With respect to periphrasis this phenomenon (under the term 'overabundance' following Thornton (2011) and Thornton (2012)) is discussed in Aronoff & Lindsay (2015) and Bonami (2015), for instance. Eventually one form might disappear. This seems to be what is happening in this case: the construction with *ne*, even though it represents the way negation is implemented normally in the language, is felt to be old-fashioned by the speakers of the language and is used much less frequently (see for example notes in (Banova,

27

[626] 2005, 22)).

[627] More importantly, though, the negated future with *njama* and the non-negated
[628] future are, in some sense, in paradigmatic opposition to each other: they
[629] express the same morphosemantic feature, but with polar values for negation.[20]
[630] The two forms, however, bring together in one paradigm function words based
[631] historically on two different lexemes, *šta* 'want' and the fused negated form
[632] *njamam* of the verb *imam* 'have'. It is for this reason that these forms are
[633] reminiscent of suppletion in inflectional paradigms. Similar 'suppletion' can be
[634] found in the split auxiliary systems of Romance and Germanic. We mentioned
[635] before that paradigmatic organization can be an important reflex of grammatical
[636] status. A very lucid discussion of paradigmatic organisation and (periphrastic)
[637] constructions can be found in Bonami (2015).

[638] The negated future can also be used to reinforce the point that two constructions
[639] which exhibit paradigmatic organization, and which appear to be equally grammatical,
[640] can be affected differently by the processes of grammaticalization. The properties
[641] of the future clitic auxiliary have been discussed already. To enable a comparison
[642] with the negated future construction with *have*, a brief characterisation is included
[643] below.

[644] Like the future clitic, the fused negated form of the verb *imam* 'have' is
[645] invariant and does not agree with the subject. However, *njama* is not a clitic.
[646] It can easily take clause-initial position and it can be separated from the *da*-form
[647] of the verb by fairly substantial syntactic material as in (22) (see also (Nicolova,
[648] 2008, 305-306)):

[649] (22) *Njama   v nikakăv slučaj da tărsja   partijna podkrepa.*
         have.not in no   case   DA seek.1SG party   support
[650]   'Under no circumstances will I seek support from the party'.

---

[20]If we assume that these constructions express a value of the feature 'tense', then they are also in paradigmatic opposition to inflected tense forms.

⁶⁵¹   *Njama* is different from *šte* also in so far as it takes a verb with the particle

⁶⁵² *da*.[21] In this respect *njama* behaves in a way that is similar to modal verbs

⁶⁵³ like *trjabva* 'must' and *iskam* 'want'. Although *njama* has frozen in the default

⁶⁵⁴ agreement form (similar to *trjabva* 'must'), the verb embedded in the *da*-clause

⁶⁵⁵ does agree with the subject, so the information about the subject is recoverable

⁶⁵⁶ from it, compare (23a) with (23b) below. Both in modal verb and in the *njama*

⁶⁵⁷ future constructions the subject can be expressed overtly, see (23c) and (23d).

⁶⁵⁸ In some modal verb constructions the embedded verb can have a subject that

⁶⁵⁹ is different from that of the main clause (see 23e). By contrast, *njama* and the

⁶⁶⁰ subcategorised clause cannot have different subjects (23f). In this respect *njama*

⁶⁶¹ is not unique, however: some other modal verbs like *trjabva* 'must' behave in

⁶⁶² the same way (23g). *Njama* does not appear to contribute a predicate of its

⁶⁶³ own, and cannot be modified, unlike, for example, *iskam* 'want' (see 23h and

⁶⁶⁴ 23i).

⁶⁶⁵ (23)   a. *Njama   da dam   cvetjata   na učitelkata.*
            have.not DA give.1SG flowers.DEF to teacher.F.DEF

⁶⁶⁶   '(I) won't give the flowers to the teacher'.

⁶⁶⁷   b. *Njama   da dade   cvetjata   na učitelkata.*
            have.not DA give.3SG flowers.DEF to teacher.F.DEF

⁶⁶⁸   '(He) won't give the flowers to the teacher'

⁶⁶⁹   c. *Maria njama   da dade   cvetjata   na učitelkata.*
            Maria have.not DA give.3SG flowers.DEF to teacher.F.DEF

⁶⁷⁰   'Maria won't give the flowers to the teacher'.

⁶⁷¹   d. *Maria iska   da dade   cvetjata   na učitelkata.*
            Maria want.3SG DA give.3SG flowers.DEF to teacher.F.DEF

---

[21]The status of *da* has been discussed in the literature but, to the best of my knowledge, there is no definitive analysis. Interesting data are presented and interpreted in Rudin (1986), Simov & Kolkovska (2002) amongst others. What is important here is only to note that the syntactic structure associated with the *njama*-construction is more complex than that associated with the *šte*-construction. *Da* has been glossed simply as DA.

₆₇₂   'Maria wants to give the flowers to the teacher'

₆₇₃   e. *Az iskam   Maria da dade   cvetjata   na učitelkata.*
       I   want.1SG Maria DA give.3SG flowers.DEF to teacher.F.DEF

₆₇₄   'I want Maria to give the flowers to the teacher'

₆₇₅   f. **Az njama   Maria da dade   cvetjata   na učitelkata.*
       I   have.not Maria DA give.3SG flowers.DEF to teacher.F.DEF

₆₇₆   '?I won't Maria to give the flowers to the teacher'

₆₇₇   g. **Az trjabva Maria da dade   cvetjata   na učitelkata.*
       I   must   Maria DA give.3SG flowers.DEF to teacher.F.DEF

₆₇₈   '?I must Maria to give the flowers to the teacher'

₆₇₉   h. *Az mnogo iskam   da dam   cvetjata   na učitelkata.*
       I   very   want.1SG DA give.1SG flowers.DEF to teacher.F.DEF

₆₈₀   'I very much want to give the flowers to the teacher'

₆₈₁   i. **Az mnogo njama   da dam   cvetjata   na učitelkata.*
       I   very   have.not da give.1SG flowers.DEF to teacher.F.DEF

₆₈₂   'I very much won't give the flowers to the teacher'.

₆₈₃   As we can see, the morphosyntactic properties of the *njama + da +* verb
₆₈₄ construction are quite different from those of its non-negated counterpart with
₆₈₅ *šte*. However, it is not clear on what grounds we might wish to claim that this
₆₈₆ construction is less grammatical than the one with *šte*, since it is semantically
₆₈₇ analogous to the one with *šte* and enjoys the same generality.

₆₈₈   One property the grammatical constructions we have reviewed share is that
₆₈₉ the function word/clitic does not contribute a predicate of its own. We already
₆₉₀ saw evidence for this in the discussion of the *njama* construction above, and this
₆₉₁ is even clearer for constructions where the function word has cliticised. It is the
₆₉₂ equivalence of (lexical) meaning between the construction as a whole and the
₆₉₃ lexical word contained in it that leads to descriptions where the construction is
₆₉₄ defined as a 'form of a lexeme'.

₆₉₅   And conversely, when we find a construction that seems to express some
₆₉₆ abstract grammatical meaning (e.g. time reference), but also appears to be

associated with some meaning that is over and above the meaning of the lexical form contained in it, we may wish to deny it the status of a 'word form'. This is illustrated in the next section with Bulgarian and Macedonian data.

6   Additional meanings

This section is devoted to a construction that has developed meanings over and above the lexical meaning associated with the non-auxiliary verb it comprises. According to (Xaralampiev, 2001, 146), Trifonov (1908) drew attention to constructions with impersonal (3SG) *ima* 'have' + *da* + verb in Modern Bulgarian. These constructions, which are descendants of the Old Bulgarian future tense constructions with *ima*, are formal counterparts of the *njama*-constructions discussed above. But while the constructions with *njama* became part of the future tense, the constructions with the non-negated 'have' acquired additional meaning, i.e. they lexicalised.

As Dahl (2004) points out, a number of patterns may compete to express the same linguistic meaning. As in the case of words with similar meanings, the competition could be resolved in various ways: a pattern might disappear and give way to a competitor (the forms of the future negated with *ne* above), or it might specialise by acquiring additional meanings. The *ima*-*da*-verb construction, which initially competed to be the exponent of future tense, seems to have suffered the latter fate. Examples of this construction can be found in (24):

(24) a. *Ima   da čakaš   da dojde   rejsa.*
          have.PRS.3SG DA wait.PRS.IPFV.2SG DA come.PRS.3SG bus.THE
          'You will have to wait for a long time for the bus to come.'

      b. *Ima   da se   čudite   kade ste*
          have.PRS.3SG DA REFL wonder.PRS.IPFV.2PL where be.PRS.2PL
          složili   cvetjata.
          putLPTCP.PL flowers.THE
          'You will wonder for a long time where you put the flowers.'

31

As we can see from the translations above, the *ima-da*-verb construction has the additional meaning that the eventuality denoted by the verb is lengthy and unavoidable and, in some context, obligatory. What is more, the *ima-da*-verb constructions are limited to colloquial language. It is not clear that this additional meaning should be associated specifically with the function word in this construction (according to (Xaralampiev, 2001, 146) the impersonal verb *ima* has lost its lexical meaning and serves only to indicate futurity).

In the modern language the *ima-da*-verb constructions are limited to imperfective verbs, though this is a new restriction according to (Xaralampiev, 2001, 146). He gives the following relatively recent (early 20th century) example of an *ima-da*-verb construction with a perfective verb:[22]

(25) *Osoben kurier otiva   24 casa   napred   v grada, gdeto*
     special courier go.PRS.3SG 24 hours in-advance in town, where
     knjazăt   ima   da spre.
     duke.DEF have.PRS.3SG DA stop.PRS.PFV.3SG
     'A special courier goes to the city, where the duke will have to stop, 24 hours in advance.

If indeed this construction has narrowed down its scope, then in some sense it has suffered loss of grammatical status.

Formally, the *ima-da*-verb construction is similar to its negated cognate with *njama* 'not-have'. *Ima* 'have' shows no agreement with the subject (compare 26a and 26b). It does not behave like a clitic. It can be clause-initial and though some material can come between *ima* and the verb (see 26c), there is a strong preference for *ima* to stay close to the verb. As in the case of *njama*, *ima* and the verb in the subcategorized clause must have the same subject (see 26d).[23]

---

[22]With a perfective the additional lexical meaning expressed by the *ima-da*-verb construction is less pronounced.

[23]The *ima-da*-verb construction needs to be distinguished from another construction with an inflecting verb *imam* 'have' which agrees with the subject. The construction with the

(26) a. *Ima   da čakaš   da dojde   rejsa.*
   have.PRS.3SG DA wait.PRS.IPFV.2SG DA come.PRS.3SG bus.DEF

   'You will have to wait awhile for the bus to come.'

b. *Ima   da čaka   da dojde   rejsa.*
   have.PRS.3SG DA wait.PRS.IPFV.3SG DA come.PRS.3SG bus.DEF

   '(He/she/it) will have to wait awhile for the bus to come.'

c. *Maria ima   dalgo da čaka   da*
   Maria have.PRS.3SG long DA wait.PRS.IPFV.2SG DA
   dojde   rejsa.
   come.PRS.3SG bus.DEF

   'Maria will have to wait awhile for the bus to come.'

d. **Marja ima   az da čakam   da dojde*
   Maria have.PRS.3SG I DA wait.PRS.IPFV.1SG DA come.PRS.3SG
   rejsa.
   bus.DEF

   '?Maria will I have to wait for a while for the bus to come.'

By contrast, the cognate Macedonian construction can express futurity, albeit rarely, according to the research cited in (Tomič, 2012, 361-362). More commonly, constructions with *ima* express modal meanings such as obligation, and, with first person subjects, duty. The following examples are from (Tomič, 2012, 362):

(27) a. *Ima   da dojdat!*
   have.PRS.3SG DA come.PRS.3PL

   'They have to come!'

b. *Ima   da go   zememe!*
   have.PRS.3SG DA 3SG.ACC.M take.PRS.1PL

   'We shall have to take it!'

---

inflecting *imam* is closer to the English 'have', 'must', i.e. 'to have a task, or an obligation'. Further details are available in (Xaralampiev, 2001, 146).

7 Relationships with inflected forms

In the previous section we encountered a construction which has acquired additional semantics (it has lexicalised) and has lost some of its scope, i.e. it does not admit all the lexemes of the relevant class, but only a subclass. One of the reasons, then, why such a construction might be considered less grammatical is its lack of generality. This section contains a brief discussion of a construction which, in comparison to its inflected counterparts, seems to present the opposite phenomenon – it is 'overly' general.

The construction in question is a negative imperative and can be found again in Bulgarian. This language, like other Slavic languages, has an inflected imperative which in the modern language is restricted to 2SG and 2PL forms (illustrated in 28 below with the verb 'give'). Without negation imperative forms are possible with both perfective and imperfective verbs, whereas with negation only imperfective verbs are accepted.

(28)

2SG PERFECTIVE	2PL PERFECTIVE
daj	dajte
2SG IMPERFECTIVE	2PL IMPERFECTIVE
davaj	davajte
2SG NEGATED PERFECTIVE	2PL NEGATED PERFECTIVE
*ne daj	*ne dajte
2SG NEGATED IMPERFECTIVE	2PL NEGATED IMPERFECTIVE
ne davaj	ne davajte

The negated forms have periphrastic counterparts, with a fused negative-imperative verb, historically a form of a lexeme with the meaning 'not do', and a shortened infinitive form of the lexical verb (only imperfective forms are given, as only imperfective forms are possible):[24]

---

[24]As mentioned before, the infinitive has disappeared from Modern Bulgarian. The form

34

₇₈₃ (29)

2SG NEGATED	2PL NEGATED
nedej dava	nedejte dava

⁷⁸⁴ There is another construction, however, which is identified by a number of
⁷⁸⁵ scholars (see, for example, (Čakărova, 2009, 64ff.) and references therein) as
⁷⁸⁶ a grammatical means for expressing a negative imperative. It consists of an
⁷⁸⁷ invariant form *stiga* 'enough' and a present perfect or shortened infinitive form
⁷⁸⁸ of the (imperfective aspect form of the) verb. It is illustrated in (30) below,
⁷⁸⁹ using present perfect forms of the verb *dam* 'give'.[25]

⁷⁹⁰ (30) *stiga săm daval*   *stiga sme davali*

   stiga si daval   *stiga ste davali*

   stiga e daval   *stiga sa davali*

⁷⁹¹ Čakărova (2001) lists a number of criteria which, according to her, define
⁷⁹² these constructions as analytic verb forms, rather than free syntactic combinations.
⁷⁹³ Implicit in some of the criteria she lists is the notion of irregularity. Grammatical
⁷⁹⁴ constructions tend to me more 'irregular' (like inflected forms), whereas syntactic
⁷⁹⁵ structures tend to be more 'regular'. More specifically, Čakărova (2009) lists
⁷⁹⁶ the following properties as being of importance in the case of the construction
⁷⁹⁷ in (30): none of its constituent parts is itself inflected for the imperative, nor
⁷⁹⁸ does it tolerate a combination with other means of expressing the imperative;
⁷⁹⁹ the form *stiga* has lost its lexical meaning (i.e. it no longer means 'enough' or
⁸⁰⁰ 'sufficient'); the construction is not marked for tense and in that sense makes

---

survives only in a limited range of patterns, which highlights yet again their status of
constructions. On the other hand, speakers often replace the disappearing shortened infinitive
with the more usual *da*-forms of verbs, such that it is also possible to say *nedej da davaš* 'don't
give (2SG)' and *nedejte da davate* 'don't give (2PL)'.

[25]According to (Čakărova, 2009, 66), these forms are more frequent that the ones with the
shortened infinitive. Note that the present perfect forms are themselves periphrastic and are
composed of the form of the verb BE in the respective person/number and the l-participle of
the verb.

no temporal distinctions (in this respect it is similar to the imperative), and the position of *stiga* relative to the verb is fixed.

However, the construction above is also in a sense more 'regular' than the respective inflected forms, or at least more 'general', given that it exists in all person/number combinations, unlike the inflected imperative. If we take the lack of 1 and 3 person forms to be definitional of imperatives, then the generality of the *stiga*-construction is problematic. In other words, comparing the behaviour of constructions to that of inflected forms could in itself be influential on how we judge their grammatical status.

There is an additional reason to doubt the grammatical status of *stiga*-constructions: they can only be used to refer to situations that have obtained for some time. For example, one can use the sentence in (31) below only when some statements have already been made. In other words, they have presuppositions that are similar to those of the English verb *stop*.

(31)   *Stiga*   *ste*   *davali*   *izjavleniia.*
      enough be.PRS.3PL give.LPTCP.PL statements

      'Stop making statements'

This construction, then, is another case in which formal properties that could indicate grammaticalization (as the ones noted by Čakǎrova (2009)) do not correlate very well with grammatical status. Our judgement of grammatical status depends to an extent on how the construction compares to related forms, for example in this case the inflected imperative.

8   Conclusion

This paper has argued, following authors like Joseph (2004) and others, that grammatical status (being grammatical) and morphologization need to be kept conceptually distinct, even though they are often intertwined. The discussion

of the *have*-perfect construction demonstrated that in two related languages, Bulgarian and Macedonian, it has made a transition from being lexical to being grammatical, with a concomitant shift from a biclausal structure to a monoclausal one and a change from a lexical verb (with lexical meaning) to an auxiliary (with grammatical meaning). The status of the construction in the two languages appears to be different, however, which could also be linked to its generality. The more limited generality of the construction in Bulgarian seems to correlate with a somewhat different set of surface properties too: in both languages there have been changes in word order but only in Macedonian agreement patterns reflect the new structure of the construction. In both languages the *have*-perfect construction has a doppelgänger - the *be*-perfect. The availability of another form might additionally impact of judgements about the place of the *have*-perfect in the system of grammatical distinctions in the two languages. The overall conclusion, namely that functional patterns and formal patterns do not necessarily align, is reminiscent of observations made with respect languages typologically different from the ones discussed here, e.g. by Enfield (2003).

However closely linked to grammatical status, formal properties are not a reliable indicator of grammatical status. Constructions that have achieved full generality and have long been considered 'grammatical forms of lexemes' in traditional grammatical descriptions can have different structures and contain function elements of different kinds, for example, full words or clitics with a range of different properties. If we assume that morphologization is not a good measure of grammatical status, we need to pay attention to other factors that might impact our judgement of how grammatical a structure is. Important aspects of being 'grammatical' seem to be the degree of abstractness of meaning, generality of application, and obligatoriness. The discussion of the

37

ima-da-verb construction aimed to show that the overall place of a construction in the system of grammatical distinctions and the relative lack of idiosyncratic semantic distinctions are also important indicators of grammatical status. The *ima-da*-verb construction appears to have lost out the position of future tense exponent to a construction with the particle *šte*. In some sense, we judge constructions as more grammatical if we can place them in a system of intersecting obligatory interrelated distinctions. Thus, a construction is more likely to be considered a tense if we can show that it stands in contrast (semantically and grammatically) with other forms that denote 'tense'.

Forms that are part of a small and closed system of obligatory intersecting (grammatical) distinctions that cross-classify a sub-set of the lexicon are often said to be in a paradigm, especially when they are inflected forms. Paradigmatic organisation, as the discussion of the future and negated future forms shows, is also independent of the formal properties of constructions. Paradigmatic organisation is often considered a hallmark of being grammatical.

Grammatical forms that are constructions, rather than inflected words, present challenges to both syntactic and morphological models. One of the properties that was associated above with being grammatical – being part of a paradigm – has been seen as an important reason to assimilate constructions into the morphology, rather than the syntax (see Börjars et al. (1997) or Sadler & Spencer (2001), more recently Bonami (2015) and Bonami & Samvellian (2015), for example). Grammatical constructions express grammatical meaning that is not always easy to pin on one of their elements, and could be in conflict with the inflections carried by elements of the constructions. Such (morphosyntactic) non-compositionality can be a challenge if an attempt is made to model these via the syntax, so a case for assimilation into a morphological model could be made (see, for example, Ackerman & Stump (2004)). The heterogeneous

38

group of entities often grouped under the label 'clitic' that appear to be neither independent words, nor proper parts of words, present problems for both a morphological and a syntactic approach (see, for example, the proposal to generate the Bulgarian past perfect tense discussed above in the syntax, but to consider the present perfect to be quasi-morphological put forward in Pitsch (2010)).

In trying to define what 'grammatical' means, this paper makes some points that are similar to those in other works, Boye & Harder (2012) for example, and references therein. For them, being grammatical is a binary property and is linked to the inability of an expression to assume prominence is discourse. Where the authors of that work admit degree of grammaticality, they link it to formal properties traditionally assumed in grammaticalization research. There are important correlations between being grammatical and having certain formal properties. The formal properties of grammatical constructions might also have important consequences for their modelling in the grammar. Overall, however, this paper extends the argument that in looking at grammatical constructions there is a need to go beyond the degree of grammaticalization of the function word and to look at properties like paradigmaticization, generality and obligatoriness.

References

Ackerman, Farrell & Gregory Stump. 2004. Paradigms and periphrastic expressions. In Louisa Sadler & Andrew Spencer (eds.), *Projecting morphology* Stanford Studies in Morphology and the Lexicon, 111–157. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.

Aronoff, Mark & Mark Lindsay. 2015. Partial organization in languages: la langue est un système où la plupart se tient. In Sandra Augendre,

Graziella Couasnon-Torlois, Déborah Lebon, Clément Michard, Gilles Boyé & Fabio Montermini (eds.), *Proceedings of the décembrettes 8th international conference on morphology*, CNRS & Université Toulouse.

Askedal, John Ole. 2008. 'Degrammaticalization' versus typology. In Thórhallur Eythórsson (ed.), *Grammatical change and linguistic theory: The Rosendal papers*, 45–77. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Avgustinova, Tania. 1994. On Bulgarian verbal clitics. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 2. 29–47.

Banova, Savelina. 2005. *Bălgarskijat glagol: praktičesko pomagalo*. Sofia: Sofijski universitet "Kliment Oxridski", Departament za ezikovo obučenie - ICS, Izdatelstvo D-r Ivan Bogorov.

Bonami, Olivier. 2015. Perphrasis as collocation. *Morphology* 25(1). 63–110.

Bonami, Olivier & Pollet Samvellian. 2015. The diversity of inflectional periphrasis in Persian. *Journal of Linguistics* 51(2). 327–382.

Bonami, Olivier & Gert Webelhuth. 2013. The phrase-structural diversity of periphrasis: a lexicalist account. In *Periphrasis: The role of syntax and morphology in paradigms*, 141–167. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Börjars, Kersti, Nigel Vincent & Carol Chapman. 1997. Paradigms, periphrases and pronominal inflection. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology 1996*, 155–180. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Boye, Kasper & Peter Harder. 2012. A usage-based theory of grammatical status and grammaticalization. *Language* 88(1). 1–44.

Brinton, Laurel J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2005. *Lexicalization and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Dunstan, Marina Chumakina, Greville Corbett, Gergana Popova & Andrew Spencer. 2012. Defining 'periphrasis': key notions. *Morphology* 233–275.

Čakărova, Krasimira. 2001. On the issue of the paradigmatic nature of some disputable analytical verbal structures in the Modern Bulgarian language or "boundary areas" in grammar. In *10 godini burgaski svoboden universitet. jubilejna naučna konferencija s meždunarodno učastie "universitetât prez tretoto xiljadoletie"*, vol. 4, 139–154. Burgas. Available at http://www.belb.net/personal/chakyrova/Burgas01.htm (accessed July 7, 2009).

Čakărova, Krasimira. 2009. *Imperativăt v săvremennija bălgarski ezik*. Plovdiv: Izdatelstvo "Pigmalion".

Corbett, Greville G. 2007. Canonical typology, suppletion, and possible words. *Language* 83(1). 8–42.

Corbett, Greville G. 2011. The penumbra of morphosyntactic feature systems. *Morphology* 21(2). 445–480.

Corbett, Greville G. 2012. *Features*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Östen. 2004. *The growth and maintenance of linguistic complexity*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Elliott, Elisabeth M. 2004. Imam ('have') plus past passive participle in the Bulgarian Erkeč dialect. In Ronelle Alexander & Vladimir Zhobov (eds.), *Revitalizing Bulgarian dialectology*, vol. 2 University of California International and Area Studies Collection, University of California Press.

Enfield, N. J. 2003. *Linguistic epidemiology: Semantics and grammar of*

language contact in mainland southeast asia. London and New York: Routledge.

Franks, Steven. 2008. Clitic placement, prosody, and the Bulgarian verbal complex. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 16(1). 91–137.

Georgiev, Vladimir. 1976. Vâznikvane na novi složni glagolni formi sâs spomagatelen glagol 'imam'. In Petâr Pašov & Ruselina Nicolova (eds.), *Pomagalo po bâlgarska morfologija. glagol.*, 294–311. Sofia: Izdatelstvo "Nauka i izkustvo". Abridged and reprinted from *Izvestija na Instituta po bâlgarski ezik*, vol. 5, 1957.

Harris, A. C. & L. Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heine, Bernd. 2003. Grammaticalization. In B. D. Joseph & R. D. Janda (eds.), *The handbook of historical linguistics*, 575–601. Oxford: Blackwell.

Joseph, Brian. 2004. Rescuing traditional (historical) linguistics from grammaticalization 'theory'. In Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde & H. Perridon (eds.), *Up and down the cline – the nature of grammaticalization*, 45–71. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kiparsky, Paul. 2004. Blocking and periphrasis in inflectional paradigms. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology*, 113–135. Dordrecht: Springer.

Kramer, Christina E. 2003. *Macedonian: A course for beginning and intermediate students*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press 2nd edn.

Lehmann, Christian. 2004. Theory and method in grammaticalization. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 32(2). 152–187.

42

Maiden, Martin & Cecilia Robustelli. 2000. *A reference grammar of modern Italian*. London: Arnold.

Manova, Stela. 2006. Paradigm linkage and Bulgarian verb inflection. Paper presented at the First Meeting of the Slavic Linguistics Society, September 2006, University of Indiana, Bloomington.

Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2006. *The syntax of compound tenses in Slavic*. Utrecht: Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics dissertation.

Mirčev, Kiril. 1976. Za sâčetanijata na glagol imam + minalo stradatelno pričastie v bâlgarski ezik. In Petâr Pašov & Ruselina Nicolova (eds.), *Pomagalo po bâlgarska morfologija. glagol.*, 565–567. Sofia: Izdatelstvo 'Nauka i izkustvo'. First published in *Bâlgarski ezik*, vol. 23, no. 6, 1973.

Nicolova, Ruselina. 2008. *Bâlgarska gramatika: Morfologija*. Sofija: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Oxridski".

Pitsch, Hagen. 2010. Complex verbs between syntax and morphology in Bulgarian. *Russian Linguistics* 34(3). 307–329.

Popova, Gergana. 2010. Features in periphrastic constructions. In Anna Kibort & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Features: Perspectives on a key notion in linguistics*, 166–184. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Popova, Gergana & Andrew Spencer. 2013. Relatedness in periphrasis: a paradigm-based perspective. In Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Periphrasis: The role of syntax and morphology in paradigms*, vol. 180 Proceedings of the British Academy, 191–225. Oxford University Press/British Academy.

Rudin, Catherine. 1986. *Aspects of Bulgarian syntax: Complementizers and WH constructions*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc.

Sadler, Louisa & Andrew Spencer. 2001. Syntax as an exponent of morphological features. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology 2000*, 71–96. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Simov, Kiril & Sia Kolkovska. 2002. Interpretacija na da-konsktrukciite v oporna frazova gramatika, vol. Proceedings of the 6th National Slavistic Readings: Slavic studies at the beginning of the 21st century. Traditions and expectations. Sofia, 26-27 April 2002, Sofia.

Smirnickij, A. I. 1959. *Morfologija anglijskogo jazyka*. Moscow: Izkatel'stvo literatury na inostrannyx jazykax.

Smirnickij, Aleksandr I. 1956. Analitičeskie formy. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2. 41–52.

Spencer, Andrew. 2001. The paradigm-based model of morphosyntax. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 99(2). 279–313.

Spencer, Andrew. 2003. Periphrastic paradigms in Bulgarian. In Uwe Junghanns & Luka Szucsich (eds.), *Syntactic structures and morphological information*, vol. 7 Interface Explorations, 249–282. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Spencer, Andrew. 2012. Sentence negation and periphrasis. In Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Periphrasis: The role of syntax and morphology in paradigms*, vol. 180 Proceedings of the British Academy, 227–266. Oxford: Oxford University Press/British Academy.

Spencer, Andrew & Anna Luís. 2012a. The canonical clitic. In Dunstan Brown, Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Canonical morphology and syntax*, 123–150. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spencer, Andrew & Anna Luís. 2012b. *Clitics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thornton, Anna M. 2011. Overabundance (multiple forms realizing the same cell): A non-canonical phenomenon in Italian verb morphology. In Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith, Maria Goldback & Marc-Olivier Hinzelin (eds.), *Morphological autonomy: Perspectives from romance inflectional morphology*, 358–81. Oxford University Press.

Thornton, Anna M. 2012. Reduction and maintenance of overabundance. a case study on italian verb paradigms. *Word Structure* 5(2). 183–2017.

Tomič, Olga Mišeska. 2004. The syntax of the Balkan Slavic future tenses. *Lingua* 114(4). 517–542.

Tomič, Olga Mišeska. 2012. *A grammar of Macedonian*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers, Inc.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2003. Constructions in grammaticalization. In Brian D. Joseph & Richard D. Janda (eds.), *The handbook of historical linguistics*, 624–647. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2011. Grammaticalization and mechanisms of change. In Heiko Narrog & Bernd Heine (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*, 19–30. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Paul J. Hopper. 2003. *Grammaticalization* Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2nd edn.

Trifonov, Ju. 1908. Značenie na složnite (opisatelni) bâdešti vremena v novobâlgarskija ezik. *Periodičesko spisanie* 9(10). 1–40.

Trousdale, Graeme. 2012. Grammaticalization, constructions and the grammaticalization of constructions. In Kristin Davidse, Tine Breban, Lieselotte Brems & Tanja Mortelmans (eds.), *Grammaticalization and language change: New reflections*, vol. 130 Studies in Language Companion Series, 167–198. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Trousdale, Graeme & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2010. Preface. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Graeme Trousdale (eds.), *Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization*, 1–18. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Vincent, Nigel & Kersti Börjars. 2010. Grammaticalization and models of language. In *Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization*, 279–299. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Wiemer, Björn. 2014. *Quo Vadis* grammaticalization theory? why complex language change is like words. *Folia Linguistica* 48(2). 425–467.

Xaralampiev, Ivan. 2001. *Istoričeska gramatika na bâlgarskija ezik*. Veliko Târnovo: Faber.