

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).

¹I owe a debt of gratitude to Bas Aarts and Andrew Spencer for helpful feedback on earlier versions of this paper, as well as to the editors and the anonymous referees for their extensive and knowledgeable suggestions. The responsibility for all remaining errors is mine.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

86 **2 Grammatical status**

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

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

- 96 i. desemanticization (or “bleaching”, semantic reduction): loss in
97 meaning content;

- 98 ii. extension (or context generalization): use in new contexts;
- 99 iii. decategorialization: loss in morphosyntactic properties characteristic
100 of the source forms, including the loss of independent word
101 status (cliticization, affixation);
- 102 iv. erosion (or “phonetic reduction”), that is, loss in phonetic substance.

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

²For 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).

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

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

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

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

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

⁴Canonical 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).

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

174 A different sense in which grammatical constructions can be seen to be
175 ‘morphological’ lies within their relationship with inflected forms in languages
176 where both are present. Grammatical constructions can be considered equivalent
177 to (inflected) word-forms. Such understanding of grammatical constructions
178 was clearly voiced as early as the middle of the last century in Smirnickij (1956)
179 and Smirnickij (1959). The clearest case is the one where syntactic structures
180 fill in cells in otherwise morphological paradigms⁵ of inflected forms (see again
181 Börjars et al. (1997), Sadler & Spencer (2001), Ackerman & Stump (2004) and
182 also Brown et al. (2012)). Sometimes the relationship between grammatical
183 constructions and inflected forms is less tight, for example the perfect construction
184 in English is semantically related to other tense/aspect forms in the language,
185 some of which are inflected. In this sense the constructions that will be discussed
186 in the next section are all grammatical. The idea that some multiword constructions
187 are essentially word-forms and should be modelled as such has become prominent
188 in work on periphrasis, especially in the context of assumptions about morphology
189 that lead to a formal morphological model which is different from the syntactic
190 one. Periphrasis, understood in this way, occupies the middle ground between
191 morphology and syntax. For very interesting discussions of periphrasis, overlapping
192 to an extent with the current one, see for instance Bonami (2015), Bonami &
193 Samvellian (2015).

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

⁵Throughout 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.

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

198 Generality is also singled out as an important element in being grammatical
199 with respect to constructions in Trousdale (2012). In this respect grammatical
200 constructions are akin to inflection. Corbett (2011) defines consistent exponence
201 across the relevant part of speech as one of the criteria associated with canonical
202 inflectional morphosyntactic features. Constructions rarely start out having
203 lexical generality. They become more general as a result of what (Dahl, 2004,
204 120f), for example, calls pattern spread, or the gradually increased ability of
205 a pattern to be used in situations where it was previously not possible. This
206 generality is linked to Stage (ii) in the grammaticalisation process described by
207 (Heine, 2003, 579) above.

208 For inflected forms that express grammatical features grammatical status
209 has been also linked to obligatoriness. Once a distinction attains grammatical
210 status to a high degree, it becomes not just something available to its speakers,
211 but something speakers must express. An English noun cannot be used in a
212 particular context without expressing number (see remarks on this aspect of
213 featurization in Dahl (2004)). A verb in an English main clause has to be
214 tensed. Features can have a number of usually mutually exclusive values (nouns
215 can be singular or plural in English, verbs can be past and non-past). If we
216 assume that one of the values of an obligatory feature is coded as a multiword
217 expression, then the obligatoriness of the feature will apply to that multiword
218 expression. It is important to point out, however, that constructions comprise
219 at least some inflected forms, so for example the English perfect construction
220 illustrated above requires that the function verb *have* be inflected in the present
221 tense (and whatever person/number values are required by agreement). In this
222 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.

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

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

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

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

- 242 1. A linguistic form is grammatical if it expresses an abstract grammatical
243 distinction; such a form will most often be in opposition to other forms
244 with which it shares lexical meaning, but differs in grammatical meaning;
- 245 2. A linguistic form with a high grammatical status admits the whole lexical
246 class it is relevant to;
- 247 3. The distinction that is expressed by a linguistic form with a high grammatical
248 status is obligatory;

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

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

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

268 **3 Different grammatical status, different morphosyntactic** 269 **properties**

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

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

281 (2) *Az sǎm čela тази книга.*
 I be.1SG.PRS read.LPTCP.SG.F this book
 282 ‘I have read this book.’

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

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

⁷The *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

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

- 299 (3) a. *Toj ima napisani osem raboti.*
 he have.3SG.PRS write.NPTCP.PL eight work.PL
 300 ‘He has written eight projects’.
- 301 b. *Az imam vzeti njakolko izpita.*
 I have.1SG.PRS take.NPTCP.PL a_few exam.PL
 302 ‘I have taken (successfully) a few exams’ or
 303 ‘I have a few exams that are successfully taken’.
- 304 c. *Te imat sazdaten kržok po literatura.*
 they have.3PL.PRS created.NPTCP.M club.M in literature
 305 ‘They had created a literature club’. or
 306 ‘They had a literature club they had created’.
- 307 d. *Imame objaven konkurs.*
 have.1PL.PRS announce.NPTCP.SG.M competition.SG.M
 308 We had announced a competition. (We had a competition announced).
- 309

310 Synchronic data suggest that this construction has attained different levels of
 311 grammatical status in different varieties of the language. According to (Xaralampiev,
 312 2001, 144), the *have*-construction is used more widely in some non-standard
 313 dialects (e.g. south-western and Thracian dialects) than in the standard variety;
 314 he also points out that in these varieties the *have*-construction is used as synonymous
 315 to the perfect *be*-construction ((Xaralampiev, 2001, 144)).

316 An early discussion of this construction in Bulgarian can be found in Georgiev
 317 (1976), who argues that it is in the process of becoming a tense in Bulgarian,
 318 even though it has not yet established itself as such. In support of his position
 319 (Georgiev, 1976, 299f.) points out that the verb *have* has undergone semantic

320 bleaching. In other words, the construction can be used to refer to things which
321 are not literally ‘owned’, which he illustrates with the example (4) below:

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

324 ‘I have ordered coal, but it hasn’t arrived yet’.

325 The source of the *have*-construction, according to Georgiev (1976), are structures
326 where the *n*-participle is used as an object complement or in a clause post-modifying
327 an object. As this example shows, at some point the participle *poračani* ‘ordered’
328 has shifted from its postnominal modifier position to a position adjacent to the
329 verb, where it could potentially be reanalysed as part of a monoclausal structure
330 with an auxiliary and a lexical verb. The *n*-participle, however, still agrees with
331 the object, whilst the verb *have* itself agrees with the sentential subject. Details
332 of a similar chain of events in English can be found in (Harris & Campbell, 1995,
333 172ff.). In an analysis of this construction using mainly Polish data (Migdalski,
334 2006, 153ff) proposes that the participle and the object form a small clause.

335 In addition to these formal properties that signal incomplete grammaticalization,
336 Georgiev (1976) himself recognises that there are perhaps even more important
337 restrictions on the *have*-construction to do with its generality. Unlike the
338 *be*-perfect tense construction, it is restricted to transitive (cf. 5a and 5b) and
339 non-stative (cf. 6a and 6b) verbs.

340 (5) a. *Tja e boledovala mnogo kato dete.*
she be.3SG.PRS be_ill.LPTCP.SG.F a_lot as child
341 ‘She has been ill a lot as a child.’
342 b. **Tja ima boleduvano mnogo kato dete.*
she have.3SG.PRS be_ill.NPTCP.SG.N a_lot as child
343 (intended) ‘She has been ill a lot as a child’

- 344 (6) a. *Toj e običal pet ženi.*
 he be.3SG love.LPTCP.M.SG five women
 345 ‘He has loved five women’.
- 346 b. **Toj ima običani pet ženi.*
 he have.3SG.PRS love.NPTCP.PL five women
 347 (intended) ‘He has loved five women’

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

- 350 (7) a. *Toj ima spečeleni šest mača*
 he have.3SG.PRS won.NPTCP.PL five matches
 351 ‘He has won five matches’.
- 352 b. *?Toj ima ritnati pet topki*
 he have.3SG.PRS kick.NPTCP.PL five balls
 353 (intended) ‘He has kicked five balls’.

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

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

⁸According 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

390 ‘The ship hit rocks’.

391 As the above examples also show, the generality of the Macedonian *have*-construction
392 goes hand in hand with some important structural characteristics. Whereas in
393 Bulgarian (and other Slavic languages) the *n*-participle agrees with the object,
394 Macedonian uses an invariant (non-agreeing) participle.⁹ To reflect this, Migdalski
395 (2006) assigns to the grammaticalized Macedonian construction a distinct syntactic
396 structure, where a small clause is replaced by a participial phrase in which the
397 participle and the object are not in a predicative relationship, but instead the
398 participle selects the object as a complement.

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

402 (10) *Imam podareni dva časovnika ot Viktor.*
have.1SG.PRS gift.NPTCP.PL two watches by Viktor
403 ‘I have two watches gifted (to me) by Viktor’.

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

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

¹⁰An 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).

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

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

¹¹The 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).

429 **4 Equal grammatical status, different morphosyntactic**
430 **properties**

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

439 (11)

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
1	(az) sǎm 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

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

444 The present tense form of the verb *sǎm* ‘be’ behaves like a clitic and enters
445 the clitic cluster: the cluster comprises auxiliaries and pronominals and takes
446 the form in (12) (for further details, see (Avgustinova, 1994), (Spencer & Luís,
447 2012b, 59-64) and references therein):

448 (12) Bulgarian clitic cluster

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

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

- 457 (13) a. *Az săm dala statiiite na studenta.*
 I be.1SG.PRS give.LPTCP.F papers.DEF to student.M.DEF
 458 ‘I have given the papers to the student.’
- 459 b. *Az săm mu gi dala.*
 I be.1SG.PRS 3SG.DAT.M 3PL.ACC give.LPTCP.F
 460 ‘I have given them to him.’
- 461 c. **Săm mu gi dala.*
 be.1SG.PRS 3SG.DAT.M 3PL.ACC give.LPTCP.F
 462 ‘(intended)(I) have given them to him.’
- 463 d. *Dala săm mu gi.*
 give.PTCP.F be.1SG.PRS cl.3SG.DAT.M cl.3PL.ACC
 464 ‘(I) have given them to him.’
- 465 e. *Dala mu gi e.*
 give.PTCP.F cl.3SG.DAT.M cl.3PL.ACC be.3SG.PRS
 466 ‘(She) has given them to him.’

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

¹²Note that Bulgarian is a pro-drop language.

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

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

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

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

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

482 (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

483 The auxiliary *bjax* ‘be.PST’ is not a clitic and does not enter the clitic cluster.
 484 Instead, it can host the cluster. For example, in (16a) below, the cluster comes to
 485 the left of the auxiliary, whereas in (16b) it comes to the left of the participle (see
 486 also (Avgustinova, 1994, 70f), (Nicolova, 2008, 301f) (Spencer & Luís, 2012b,
 487 62)).

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

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

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

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

504 So far I have argued that in constructions that appear to be equally 'grammatical'
 505 functional elements can have a different morphosyntactic status – some are
 506 clitics, and some are function words. However, entities subsumed under the
 507 label of 'clitic' often themselves have different properties (see Spencer & Luís
 508 (2012b)). By way of a brief illustration, I present the future tense construction
 509 in Bulgarian. Future tenses in Bulgarian and Macedonian will be discussed
 510 in the next section as well. The forms (in this case of the verb DAM 'give')
 511 associated with the future tense construction are shown in (17) below:

512 (17)

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

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

518 unlike the present ‘be’ auxiliary discussed earlier, can appear in absolute clause
 519 initial position (as 18c illustrates). Despite this, *šte* is not a fully accented word,
 520 as is clear from the fact that the question particle *li* cannot follow it directly (see
 521 18d – having a fully accented element to the left is a condition on the placement
 522 of *li*),¹⁵ but must follow *šte* and the lexical verb (18e).

- 523 (18) a. *Az šte dam statiite na studenta.*
 I FUT give.1SG.PRS articles.DEF to student.M.DEF
 524 ‘I will give the articles to the student’
- 525 b. **Az šte skoro dam statiite na studenta.*
 I FUT soon give.1SG.PRS articles.DEF to student.M.DEF
 526 ‘(intended) I will soon give the articles to the student.’
- 527 c. *Šte mu gi dam.*
 FUT 3SG.DAT.M 3PL.ACC give.1SG.PRS
 528 ‘(I) will give him them’
- 529 d. **Šte li dam statiite na studenta?*
 FUT Q give.1SG.PRS articles.DEF to student.M.DEF
 530 ‘(intended) Will (I) give the articles to the student’
- 531 e. *Šte dam li statiite na studenta?*
 FUT give.1SG.PRS Q articles.DEF to student.M.DEF
 532 ‘Will (I) give the articles to the student?’

533 To sum up, the auxiliaries in tense constructions have varied behaviours.¹⁶
 534 Some of them display non-clitic behaviour and some are clitics, but can have
 535 different properties. This is not surprising in itself. That similar (periphrastic)
 536 constructions can exhibit different structural properties is also noted, for example,
 537 in Bonami & Webelhuth (2013). What I wish to emphasise here is that this

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

¹⁶The 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.

540 **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 ‘cliticness’ 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:

¹⁷With 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.

558 (19)

	Perfective	Imperfective
Infinitive	<i>dat'</i>	<i>davat'</i>
Present (1SG)	—	<i>daju</i>
Future (1SG)	<i>dam</i>	<i>budu davat'</i>

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

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

¹⁸Analyses 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.

¹⁹As 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.

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

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

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

- 605 (20) 1 šte dam šte dadem
 2 šte dadeš šte dadete
 3 šte dade šte dadat

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

608 (21)

Negated future with <i>ne</i>		Negated future with <i>njama</i>		
Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural	
1	<i>ne šte dam</i>	<i>ne šte dadem</i>	<i>njama da dam</i>	<i>njama da dadem</i>
2	<i>ne šte dadeš</i>	<i>ne šte dadete</i>	<i>njama da dadeš</i>	<i>njama da dadete</i>
3	<i>ne šte dade</i>	<i>ne šte dadat</i>	<i>njama da dade</i>	<i>njama da dadat</i>

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

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 nikakäv slučaj da tärsja partijna podkrepa.*
 have.not in no case DA seek.1SG party support
650 ‘Under no circumstances will I seek support from the party’.

²⁰If 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

²¹The 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

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

700 6 Additional meanings

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

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

- 717 (24) a. *Ima da čakaš da dojde rejsa.*
 have.PRS.3SG DA wait.PRS.IPFV.2SG DA come.PRS.3SG bus.THE
 718 ‘You will have to wait for a long time for the bus to come.’
- 719 b. *Ima da se čudite kade ste*
 have.PRS.3SG DA REFL wonder.PRS.IPFV.2PL where be.PRS.2PL
 720 *složili cvetjata.*
 putLPTCP.PL flowers.THE
 721 ‘You will wonder for a long time where you put the flowers.’

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

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

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

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

739 Formally, the *ima-da*-verb construction is similar to its negated cognate with
 740 *njama* ‘not-have’. *Ima* ‘have’ shows no agreement with the subject (compare
 741 26a and 26b). It does not behave like a clitic. It can be clause-initial and though
 742 some material can come between *ima* and the verb (see 26c), there is a strong
 743 preference for *ima* to stay close to the verb. As in the case of *njama*, *ima* and
 744 the verb in the subcategorized clause must have the same subject (see 26d).²³

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

²³The *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

- 745 (26) a. *Ima da čakaš da dojde rejsa.*
 have.PRS.3SG DA wait.PRS.IPFV.2SG DA come.PRS.3SG bus.DEF
 746 ‘You will have to wait awhile for the bus to come.’
- 747 b. *Ima da čaka da dojde rejsa.*
 have.PRS.3SG DA wait.PRS.IPFV.3SG DA come.PRS.3SG bus.DEF
 748 ‘(He/she/it) will have to wait awhile for the bus to come.’
- 749 c. *Maria ima dalgo da čaka da*
 Maria have.PRS.3SG long DA wait.PRS.IPFV.2SG DA
 750 *dojde rejsa.*
 come.PRS.3SG bus.DEF
 751 ‘Maria will have to wait awhile for the bus to come.’
- 752 d. **Marja ima az da čakam da dojde*
 Maria have.PRS.3SG I DA wait.PRS.IPFV.1SG DA come.PRS.3SG
 753 *rejsa.*
 bus.DEF
 754 ‘?Maria will I have to wait for a while for the bus to come.’

755 By contrast, the cognate Macedonian construction can express futurity,
 756 albeit rarely, according to the research cited in (Tomič, 2012, 361-362). More
 757 commonly, constructions with *ima* express modal meanings such as obligation,
 758 and, with first person subjects, duty. The following examples are from (Tomič,
 759 2012, 362):

- 760 (27) a. *Ima da dojdət!*
 have.PRS.3SG DA come.PRS.3PL
 761 ‘They have to come!’
- 762 b. *Ima da go zememe!*
 have.PRS.3SG DA 3SG.ACC.M take.PRS.1PL
 763 ‘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).

764 **7 Relationships with inflected forms**

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

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

778 (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

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

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

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, (Čakářova, 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 sãm daval stiga sme davali*
stiga si daval stiga ste davali
stiga e daval stiga sa davali

791 Čakářova (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 be more ‘irregular’ (like inflected forms), whereas syntactic
 795 structures tend to be more ‘regular’. More specifically, Čakářova (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)’.

²⁵According to (Čakářova, 2009, 66), these forms are more frequent than 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 I-participle of
 the verb.

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

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

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

815 (31) *Stiga ste davali izjavleniia.*
 enough be.PRS.3PL give.LPTCP.PL statements
816 ‘Stop making statements’

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

822 8 Conclusion

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

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

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

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

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

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

880 group of entities often grouped under the label ‘clitic’ that appear to be neither
881 independent words, nor proper parts of words, present problems for both a
882 morphological and a syntactic approach (see, for example, the proposal to
883 generate the Bulgarian past perfect tense discussed above in the syntax, but
884 to consider the present perfect to be quasi-morphological put forward in Pitsch
885 (2010)).

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

898 **References**

- 899 Ackerman, Farrell & Gregory Stump. 2004. Paradigms and periphrastic
900 expressions. In Louisa Sadler & Andrew Spencer (eds.), *Projecting morphology*
901 *Stanford Studies in Morphology and the Lexicon*, 111–157. Stanford,
902 California: CSLI Publications.
- 903 Aronoff, Mark & Mark Lindsay. 2015. Partial organization in languages:
904 la langue est un système où la plupart se tient. In Sandra Augendre,

- 905 Graziella Couasnon-Torlois, Déborah Lebon, Clément Michard, Gilles Boyé
906 & Fabio Montermini (eds.), *Proceedings of the décembrettes 8th international*
907 *conference on morphology*, CNRS & Université Toulouse.
- 908 Askedal, John Ole. 2008. ‘Degrammaticalization’ versus typology. In
909 Thórhallur Eythórsson (ed.), *Grammatical change and linguistic theory:*
910 *The Rosendal papers*, 45–77. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
911 Publishing Company.
- 912 Avgustinova, Tania. 1994. On Bulgarian verbal clitics. *Journal of Slavic*
913 *Linguistics* 2. 29–47.
- 914 Banova, Savelina. 2005. *Bálgarskijat glagol: praktičesko pomagalo*. Sofia:
915 Sofijski universitet ”Kliment Oxridski”, Departament za ezikovo obučenie -
916 ICS, Izdatelstvo D-r Ivan Bogorov.
- 917 Bonami, Olivier. 2015. Periphrasis as collocation. *Morphology* 25(1). 63–110.
- 918 Bonami, Olivier & Pollet Samvellian. 2015. The diversity of inflectional
919 periphrasis in Persian. *Journal of Linguistics* 51(2). 327–382.
- 920 Bonami, Olivier & Gert Webelhuth. 2013. The phrase-structural diversity of
921 periphrasis: a lexicalist account. In *Periphrasis: The role of syntax and*
922 *morphology in paradigms*, 141–167. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 923 Börjars, Kersti, Nigel Vincent & Carol Chapman. 1997. Paradigms, periphrases
924 and pronominal inflection. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook*
925 *of morphology 1996*, 155–180. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- 926 Boye, Kasper & Peter Harder. 2012. A usage-based theory of grammatical status
927 and grammaticalization. *Language* 88(1). 1–44.
- 928 Brinton, Laurel J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2005. *Lexicalization and language*
929 *change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 930 Brown, Dunstan, Marina Chumakina, Greville Corbett, Gergana Popova &
931 Andrew Spencer. 2012. Defining 'periphrasis': key notions. *Morphology*
932 233–275.
- 933 Čakárova, Krasimira. 2001. On the issue of the paradigmatic nature of
934 some disputable analytical verbal structures in the Modern Bulgarian
935 language or “boundary areas” in grammar. In *10 godini burgaski*
936 *svoboden universitet. jubilejna naučna konferencija s međunarodno učastie*
937 *“universitetât prez tretoto xiljadoletie”*, vol. 4, 139–154. Burgas. Available
938 at <http://www.belb.net/personal/chakyrova/Burgas01.htm> (accessed July 7,
939 2009).
- 940 Čakárova, Krasimira. 2009. *Imperativât v sävremennija bălgarski ezik*. Plovdiv:
941 Izdatelstvo “Pigmalion”.
- 942 Corbett, Greville G. 2007. Canonical typology, suppletion, and possible words.
943 *Language* 83(1). 8–42.
- 944 Corbett, Greville G. 2011. The penumbra of morphosyntactic feature systems.
945 *Morphology* 21(2). 445–480.
- 946 Corbett, Greville G. 2012. *Features*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 947 Dahl, Östen. 2004. *The growth and maintenance of linguistic complexity*.
948 Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 949 Elliott, Elisabeth M. 2004. Imam (‘have’) plus past passive participle in
950 the Bulgarian Erkeč dialect. In Ronelle Alexander & Vladimir Zhobov
951 (eds.), *Revitalizing Bulgarian dialectology*, vol. 2 University of California
952 International and Area Studies Collection, University of California Press.
- 953 Enfield, N. J. 2003. *Linguistic epidemiology: Semantics and grammar of*

- 954 *language contact in mainland southeast asia*. London and New York:
955 Routledge.
- 956 Franks, Steven. 2008. Clitic placement, prosody, and the Bulgarian verbal
957 complex. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 16(1). 91–137.
- 958 Georgiev, Vladimir. 1976. Vâznikvane na novi složni glagolni formi sâs
959 spomagatelen glagol ‘imam’. In Petâr Pašov & Ruselina Nicolova (eds.),
960 *Pomagalo po bâlgarska morfologija. glagol.*, 294–311. Sofia: Izdatelstvo
961 “Nauka i izkustvo”. Abridged and reprinted from *Izvestija na Instituta po*
962 *bâlgarski ezik*, vol. 5, 1957.
- 963 Harris, A. C. & L. Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic*
964 *perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 965 Heine, Bernd. 2003. Grammaticalization. In B. D. Joseph & R. D. Janda (eds.),
966 *The handbook of historical linguistics*, 575–601. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 967 Joseph, Brian. 2004. Rescuing traditional (historical) linguistics from
968 grammaticalization ‘theory’. In Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde & H. Perridon
969 (eds.), *Up and down the cline – the nature of grammaticalization*, 45–71.
970 Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 971 Kiparsky, Paul. 2004. Blocking and periphrasis in inflectional paradigms. In
972 Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology*, 113–135.
973 Dordrecht: Springer.
- 974 Kramer, Christina E. 2003. *Macedonian: A course for beginning and*
975 *intermediate students*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press 2nd
976 edn.
- 977 Lehmann, Christian. 2004. Theory and method in grammaticalization.
978 *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 32(2). 152–187.

- 979 Maiden, Martin & Cecilia Robustelli. 2000. *A reference grammar of modern*
980 *Italian*. London: Arnold.
- 981 Manova, Stela. 2006. Paradigm linkage and Bulgarian verb inflection. Paper
982 presented at the First Meeting of the Slavic Linguistics Society, September
983 2006, University of Indiana, Bloomington.
- 984 Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2006. *The syntax of compound tenses in Slavic*. Utrecht:
985 Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics dissertation.
- 986 Mirčev, Kiril. 1976. Za sâčetanijata na glagol imam + minalo stradatelno
987 pričastie v bâlgarski ezik. In Petâr Pašov & Ruselina Nicolova (eds.),
988 *Pomagalo po bâlgarska morfologija. glagol.*, 565–567. Sofia: Izdatelstvo
989 ‘Nauka i izkustvo’. First published in *Bâlgarski ezik*, vol. 23, no. 6, 1973.
- 990 Nicolova, Ruselina. 2008. *Bâlgarska gramatika: Morfologija*. Sofija:
991 Universitetsko izdatelstvo ”Sv. Kliment Oxridski”.
- 992 Pitsch, Hagen. 2010. Complex verbs between syntax and morphology in
993 Bulgarian. *Russian Linguistics* 34(3). 307–329.
- 994 Popova, Gergana. 2010. Features in periphrastic constructions. In Anna Kibort
995 & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Features: Perspectives on a key notion in*
996 *linguistics*, 166–184. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 997 Popova, Gergana & Andrew Spencer. 2013. Relatedness in periphrasis: a
998 paradigm-based perspective. In Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett
999 (eds.), *Periphrasis: The role of syntax and morphology in paradigms*,
1000 vol. 180 Proceedings of the British Academy, 191–225. Oxford University
1001 Press/British Academy.
- 1002 Rudin, Catherine. 1986. *Aspects of Bulgarian syntax: Complementizers and*
1003 *WH constructions*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc.

- 1004 Sadler, Louisa & Andrew Spencer. 2001. Syntax as an exponent of morphological
1005 features. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology*
1006 *2000*, 71–96. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- 1007 Simov, Kiril & Sia Kolkovska. 2002. Interpretacija na da-konstrukciite v
1008 oporna frazova gramatika, vol. Proceedings of the 6th National Slavistic
1009 Readings: Slavic studies at the beginning of the 21st century. Traditions and
1010 expectations. Sofia, 26-27 April 2002, Sofia.
- 1011 Smirnickij, A. I. 1959. *Morfologija anglijskogo jazyka*. Moscow: Izkatel'stvo
1012 literatury na inostrannyx jazykax.
- 1013 Smirnickij, Aleksandr I. 1956. Analitičeskie formy. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2.
1014 41–52.
- 1015 Spencer, Andrew. 2001. The paradigm-based model of morphosyntax.
1016 *Transactions of the Philological Society* 99(2). 279–313.
- 1017 Spencer, Andrew. 2003. Periphrastic paradigms in Bulgarian. In Uwe Junghanns
1018 & Luka Szucsich (eds.), *Syntactic structures and morphological information*,
1019 vol. 7 Interface Explorations, 249–282. Berlin and New York: Mouton de
1020 Gruyter.
- 1021 Spencer, Andrew. 2012. Sentence negation and periphrasis. In Marina
1022 Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Periphrasis: The role of syntax*
1023 *and morphology in paradigms*, vol. 180 Proceedings of the British Academy,
1024 227–266. Oxford: Oxford University Press/British Academy.
- 1025 Spencer, Andrew & Anna Luís. 2012a. The canonical clitic. In Dunstan Brown,
1026 Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Canonical morphology and*
1027 *syntax*, 123–150. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- 1028 Spencer, Andrew & Anna Luís. 2012b. *Clitics: An introduction*. Cambridge:
1029 Cambridge University Press.
- 1030 Thornton, Anna M. 2011. Overabundance (multiple forms realizing the same
1031 cell): A non-canonical phenomenon in Italian verb morphology. In Martin
1032 Maiden, John Charles Smith, Maria Goldback & Marc-Olivier Hinzelin (eds.),
1033 *Morphological autonomy: Perspectives from romance inflectional morphology*,
1034 358–81. Oxford University Press.
- 1035 Thornton, Anna M. 2012. Reduction and maintenance of overabundance. a case
1036 study on italian verb paradigms. *Word Structure* 5(2). 183–2017.
- 1037 Tomič, Olga Mišeska. 2004. The syntax of the Balkan Slavic future tenses.
1038 *Lingua* 114(4). 517–542.
- 1039 Tomič, Olga Mišeska. 2012. *A grammar of Macedonian*. Bloomington, IN:
1040 Slavica Publishers, Inc.
- 1041 Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2003. Constructions in grammaticalization. In
1042 Brian D. Joseph & Richard D. Janda (eds.), *The handbook of historical*
1043 *linguistics*, 624–647. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- 1044 Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2011. Grammaticalization and mechanisms of
1045 change. In Heiko Narrog & Bernd Heine (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of*
1046 *grammaticalization*, 19–30. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1047 Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Paul J. Hopper. 2003. *Grammaticalization*
1048 Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
1049 2nd edn.
- 1050 Trifonov, Ju. 1908. Značenje na složnite (opisatelni) badešti vremena v
1051 novobâlgarskija ezik. *Periodičesko spisanie* 9(10). 1–40.

- 1052 Trousdale, Graeme. 2012. Grammaticalization, constructions and the
1053 grammaticalization of constructions. In Kristin Davidse, Tine Breban,
1054 Lieselotte Brems & Tanja Mortelmans (eds.), *Grammaticalization and*
1055 *language change: New reflections*, vol. 130 Studies in Language Companion
1056 Series, 167–198. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing
1057 Company.
- 1058 Trousdale, Graeme & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2010. Preface. In
1059 Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Graeme Trousdale (eds.), *Gradience, gradualness*
1060 *and grammaticalization*, 1–18. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
1061 Publishing Company.
- 1062 Vincent, Nigel & Kersti Börjars. 2010. Grammaticalization and models
1063 of language. In *Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization*, 279–299.
1064 Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- 1065 Wiemer, Björn. 2014. *Quo Vadis* grammaticalization theory? why complex
1066 language change is like words. *Folia Linguistica* 48(2). 425–467.
- 1067 Xaralampiev, Ivan. 2001. *Istoričeska gramatika na bálgarskija ezik*. Veliko
1068 Târnovo: Faber.