

Christina E. Kramer

## Negation and the Grammaticalization of *Have* and *Want* Futures in Bulgarian and Macedonian

Current theories of grammaticalization offer a general framework in which to compare the varied development, formation and uses of the future tenses in various Balkan languages. Works on grammaticalization often mention the similarities in the analytic Balkan future containing a deparadigmaticized particle derived from the verb *to want*, but no detailed study within this framework has been done. While within Balkan linguistics the use of the verb *to want* as a future tense auxiliary verb has been included among the canonical Balkan features since Sandfeld (1930), the development of *have* futures has been widely overlooked. The varied subsequent developments of the auxiliary *want* and its relation to *have* futures in Macedonian and Bulgarian, and its implications for language typology, language contact and theories of grammaticalization will be the topic of this paper, the beginning of a larger study encompassing the grammaticalization of *want* and *have* futures in all the Balkan languages.

Grammaticalization is primarily understood as the diachronic process through which lexical words lose their independent status; their meanings become generalized until such forms take on grammatical meanings and are subject to phonological, morphological and syntactic change. The oft cited example is the English *go* future, where the motion verb *to go* developed into a proximate future, 'I'm going to bake a cake' gives rise to forms such as 'I'm gonna bake a cake', or the further reduced<sup>1</sup> 'Amo bake a cake'. Here the grammaticalized future particle is differentiated from the full lexical word *going*, note, for example \*I'm gonna the store or \*Amo the store. Much recent scholarship has focused as well on the synchronic aspect of grammaticalization. Synchronic studies place emphasis on the current state of grammaticalization processes showing uneven rates and different paths lexical items may have taken. Hacking (1996) writes: "Such work underscores the essentially noncomplete nature of grammars and offers an explanation for those areas in a language's grammar which are malleable or in flux." This study, while recognizing the important task of charting the historical development of these competing futures, will focus exclusively on the synchronic state of grammaticalization of the *have* and *want* futures in Bulgarian and Macedonian.

<sup>1</sup> In some dialects. Compare also *ãgo* in Chicago English.

Most general works on the Balkan sprachbund cite the shared development of a future formed with the verb *to want* without further elucidation of parallel and diverse developments.<sup>2</sup> When detailed comparisons are made, it is generally from the point of view of morphological development. There are other interesting questions: from a typological point of view it is significant that all the Balkan languages, including Macedonian and Bulgarian, developed a future tense with the verb *to want* and a secondary future with the verb *to have* which expresses varying degrees of necessity in different Balkan languages, compare, for example Macedonian: *Ima da odam* 'I have to/I will go' and Geg Albanian *Kam me shkue* 'I have to/I will go. Moreover, none of these languages developed a *going* future such as developed in the non-Balkan Romance languages and English. The subsequent development of these 'want' auxiliaries has not been the same in Bulgarian and Macedonian, and the complex relationship between the *want* and *have* futures, particularly in negative contexts, has also developed differently in the two languages. These differences are discussed here in synchronic terms, but eventually they will have to be examined in their diachronic and dialectal aspects. It is likely that the different paths of grammaticalization will point to an early east/west split in Eastern Balkan Slavic (i.e. Bulgarian and Macedonian).

In order to compare the degree of grammaticalization of the *want* and *have* futures in Bulgarian and Macedonian, I propose to analyze these forms on different levels incorporating the parameters proposed by Traugott, Bybee, et al, i.e. the cline of grammaticality:

content item → grammatical word → clitic → affix

as well as the paradigm for the grammaticalization of future tenses proposed by Bybee, Pagliuca and Perkins, which takes into account the types of modal meaning found in future forms. Bybee et al (1991:18–19) propose a path of development of future tenses in which a verb expressing desire can develop future meaning and that certain predictions can be made concerning both the types of modal uses of the future and the time at which various uses develop in the course of grammaticalization.<sup>3</sup> The proposed scale of grammaticality is on factors such as decategorialization, lack of inflection for person or tense, lack of syntactic autonomy, and semantic features, namely, the types of modal meaning that can be conveyed. I will evaluate the forms according to the following parameters:

<sup>2</sup> See Kramer 1994 for an overview on *want* futures in Balkan languages.

<sup>3</sup> I will not use here the exact formulation proposed by Bybee et al. The numerical rating they assign to various types of futures may be appropriate at a later stage of this project. They do not account for the development of iterative-habitual meaning and this too will have to be integrated into the current model.

1. degree of inflection for person and/or tense in auxiliary and degree of reduction and fusion of the auxiliary verb;
2. degree of syntactic reinterpretation as clitic rather than verb, as evidenced by presence or absence of main verb preceded by subordinator *da* 'that';
3. syntactic relation to main verb, i.e. can be interpolated other words between the auxiliary and the main verb, e.g. cf. English 'I will gladly help', but \*I will tomorrow help;
4. semantic range, i.e. is the future auxiliary used for desire, obligation, probability, prediction, condition, imperatives, iterative/habituals etc.;
5. negative contexts, i.e. questions of special co-occurrence restrictions.

Macedonian *ke*, derived from *xŭtĕti* 'to want' is an invariant particle which forms syntactic constructions with various tense forms. The particle is no longer transparently related to the verb 'to want,' *xŭtĕti* in its lexical meaning of 'want' has been replaced by *saka*.<sup>4</sup> Syntactically, the particle is closely bound to the verb and only clitic pronouns can be interpolated between particle and verb, e.g.:

*Ke ti go dadam pismoto utre.*

\**Ke ti go utre dadam pismoto.*

Will you (indirect pro) it (reduplicated direct object) give the letter tomorrow.

'I will give you a letter tomorrow'

The main verb follows the particle without subordination to the Macedonian subordinating conjunction *da*: *ke odam*, this is in contrast to other modal verbs which require it, e.g. *treba da odam*, 'I should go, *moram da odam* I must go' *sakam da odam* 'I want to go'.

In several dialect areas (v. Vidoeski unpublished manuscript of dialect texts) the particle may be further reduced and may occur as the affix *k* before vowel-initial verbs:

Gorno Sonje: *Ajde spremaj, k-odime.*

Come on, get ready, we're going.

The invariant particle *ke* combines with past and non-past tenses and can have at least the following uses:

<sup>4</sup> There is a negative *nejkam* 'I don't want' but no positive equivalent. In Bulgarian, as well, there is a conjugated verb 'šta' meaning 'want' but both the Bulgarian and Macedonian verbs here are marginal forms which are not in competition with the verbs 'to want': *saka* (Macedonian) and *iska* (Bulgarian).

## 1. Future:

Ke dojdám vo sedm.  
I will come at seven.

## 2. command

Ke mi go kažeš krajot na filmot.  
You will tell me the end of the film.

## 3. conditionals

Da znaev, ke dojde.  
If I had known I would have come.

## 4. iterative/habitual

Koga ke se naluti ne se šeguva.  
Whenever he gets angry he doesn't joke around.

Some descriptions of Macedonian have suggested that Macedonian has a parallel future construction formed with an invariant form of the verb *to want* 'ima', e.g. *Ima da odam* 'I will go/I need to go'. Lunt (1952) states that *ima da* denotes a future action containing to a greater or lesser degree a nuance of the ordinary significance of *ima*, i.e. one has, one should, *ima da ja rešime* 'we have to/should solve it'. K. Koneski (1979: 160) calls such forms stylistically marked, expressing a greater degree of decisiveness, preparedness, or assuredness of the speaker towards the completion of the action. The *ima* future is clearly less grammaticalized according to all the above parameters: it is transparently related to the lexical verb *to have*, it is followed by the subordinator *da* and various elements can come between the *ima* and the *da* clause: *ima deneska da ja rešime!* 'We have today to solve it! The fact that such constructions denote *necessity* combined with *future intent* is seen in the examples below. *Ima da* is rejected by most speakers where either of these two meanings is contradicted. Only ten per cent accepted a, seventeen accepted b, but only with the meaning 'I must go even if I know it really isn't necessary'. Students substituted *treba* for *ima* in a, but replaced *ima da* with *ke* in b.

?Ima da odam, ama ne ke odam.  
I have to go/I will go, but I won't go.

Ima da odam, iako ne treba.  
I have to go/I will go, even though I don't need to.

On the basis of the above analysis *ima da* cannot be considered a future tense per se, but only a type of modal construction expressing need or obligation.

It has frequently been stated in the literature on Macedonian that the negative future is most frequently formed with *nema da* (Lunt 1952, B. Koneski 1967, Kepeski 1975, Usikova 1974, 77) K. Koneski, however, cited three thousand negated futures, of which 56.6 per cent were with *ne ke*, while 43.4 per cent were with *nema da*. The negated *want* future predominated in modal future constructions, e.g. I will not have to go; *nema da*, like *ima da*, retains some of its original lexical meaning which contributes to the selection of *ne ke* when a future of verbs expressing capability, *može* 'can', and necessity *mora* 'must' or *treba* 'have to, should' are used. It is in these constructions, in particular, where *ne ke* is much more prevalent. Other informants felt the forms to be synonymous, but rejected ?*nema da moram*, 'I won't have to' *nema da mi treba* 'It won't be necessary for me to'. We can conclude that these negative futures are generally in free variation, except in those contexts expressing modalities of necessity and capability.

Thus in Macedonian, *ke* is not only the sole expression of future intent and the particle used in numerous modal contexts where the speaker expresses his expectation that an event will have or would have occurred, but it is also expanding in use to include negative contexts including past conditionals, and negative futures, foremost, though not exclusively, in negated future contexts with modal verbs of *want*, *necessity* and *obligation*.

In Bulgarian we find an asymmetric grammaticalization of *to want* and a much more clearly defined split between positive *want* futures and negative *have* futures. In affirmative non-past contexts in the standard language the verb *xăteti* has developed into a fully grammaticalized particle. It is distinct from the verb *iska* 'to want', it has been fully deparadigmaticized and occurs, as in Macedonian, at the head of the clitic chain, e.g:

Šte kaža, šte kažeš.  
I will say, you will say.

Šte go vidiš li?  
Will you see him?

Šte sum nosil, šte si nosil.  
I will have brought, you will have brought.

In past tense forms, however, *šte* remains a verbal auxiliary. If we look at constructions with the so-called future-in-the-past we see that the auxiliary conjugates, the main verb is subordinated to the particle *da*, and, as seen below

in the third example, the auxiliary is not syntactically bound to the main verb, e.g.:

1. štjaj da piša; šteše da pišeš.  
I would have written, you would have written.
2. štjaj da sūm xodil; šteše da si xodil.  
I would have been gone, you would have been gone.
3. Deteto šteše ošte včera da si e napisalo domašnite upražnenija.  
The children would have already completed their homework yesterday.

There is a tendency towards grammaticalization of the verbal auxiliary in at least some of the past tense forms.<sup>5</sup> Note for example the variant forms of the past reported: *štjal sūm da sūm donesūl/šte sūm donesūl*.

Although constructions with *šte* cover a wide range of meanings including future, conditional, attenuated commands, presumption and iterative/habituals, they cannot be used for past iterative-habituals. This is one of the most significant differences between Macedonian and Bulgarian. The purely aspectual meaning of such constructions is not present in literary Bulgarian and its use is considered dialectal (Aronson 1977:26, Goľab 1964)

We can conclude that at the semantic level in affirmative constructions the Bulgarian *want* auxiliary is widely developed in Bulgarian, though it has not extended to the range of meanings seen in the Macedonian data. Syntactically the development of *want* is conservative particularly in past tense contexts. We can see, however the processes of grammaticalization in the clear tendency in the colloquial language towards the development of an invariant particle.

When we look at negative constructions, the invariant *njama da* has almost totally displaced *ne šte*. We do not see competition between forms as we did in Macedonian. Despite the almost complete reliance on *njama da* for the expression of negative futures, it is interesting to note, that some informants still did not like contexts with *njama da* plus verb of necessity:

*Toj dnes njama da može da dojde* 'He will not be able to come today'.

*Ako si svūršiš rabotata, njama da ti trjabva da govoriš s men* 'If you finish the work, you will not need to speak with me.'

<sup>5</sup> A native informant of Bulgarian has suggested to me that *šteše* is becoming generalized in colloquial speech for all persons except first-singular. This will need to be corroborated with additional research.

There was disagreement among native speakers on the occurrence of *ne šte* as a negated future. Some speakers felt that *ne šte* was more literary, others sensed a strong volitional meaning in sentences such as *Toj ne šte dojde* 'He won't/will not come'.

In the past tense, *ne šteše* preserves its volitional meaning and cannot be used in negated future-in-the-past contexts. Native informants rejected sentences such as:

\**Vlakūt ne šteše da pristigne predi tri.*

This sentence would mean, 'The train didn't want to arrive before three!' and not: 'The train wouldn't arrive before three.'

The results of this brief survey on the synchronic position of *have* and *want* futures in Bulgarian and Macedonian is presented in the table below. In order to compare the current state of grammaticalization of *want* and *have* futures, and the interrelationship between positive and negative constructions in the Bulgarian and Macedonian systems, we take a sampling of three features for past and non-past. The three features are *invariance*, *independence*, i.e. lack of *da* subordinator before verb, and *iterative-habitual*.<sup>6</sup>

In the table I have marked only the most frequent occurrences. In addition, I have not included those *ima* forms which carry a strong sense of obligation or necessity and should therefore not be considered instances of a future tense per se.

	Want				Have			
	positive		negative		positive		negative	
	B	M	B	M	B	M	B	M
Past	šte	ke	ne šte	ne ke	ima	ima	njama	nema
indep.	-	+	volition	+	obligation		-	-
invar.	-	+		+			+	+
it-hab	0	+		0			0	0
Non-past								
indep.	+	+		+			-	-
invar.	+	+	volition	+	obligation		+	+
it-hab	+	+		+			0	+

<sup>6</sup> I will cite in the table only the most usual correspondances. There are marked modal meanings which are possible, but which are irrelevant to the present discussion, e.g. the combinatory possibility of *ke da/šte da* meaning certainty, supposition, etc. *Ke da ima 11 godini* 'He must be eleven years old.' *Toj šte da dojde* 'He will surely come.'

The following contrasts between the current state of grammaticalization of *want* and *have* futures can be drawn. In the past tense the Bulgarian *want* future is neither independent nor invariant. I have marked a zero for the feature of *it-hab* since this auxiliary is not used in this context. The Macedonian *want* future is marked for all three features. In past negated contexts, Bulgarian does not use a construction with *want* since such sentences are construed as having solely a volitional meaning. Recall the example:

\*Vlakūt ne šteše da pristigne predi tri.

\*The train wouldn't want to arrive before three.

When we look at past constructions with *have*, we see a closer alignment between systems: *ima* in both languages has a strong sense of obligation and cannot be considered any type of future in the past, e.g.

Toj imaše da dojde 'He had to come'

In negative contexts in both languages the verb is not independent, but is positively marked for the feature *invariant*. The zero for the feature *it-hab* signifies that the form is not used in this context.

In the past, then, Macedonian has a fully grammaticalized particle derived from the verb *to want*. The verb *to have*, which is both syntactically less grammaticalized and semantically more restricted, plays a marginal role. In Bulgarian the auxiliary derived from *want* has not been decategorialized and must still be considered verbal. We see a clear division between positive *have* vs negative *want* futures in Bulgarian. The negated *ne šte* occurs only with negative volitional meaning, i.e. the original semantic component has not been lost.

In non-past contexts we see more parallel developments in the use of a fully grammaticalized future particle derived from *want*, but this frequently cited fact hides the more interesting fact that Bulgarian has a clear division between *want* and *have* futures, and that even where the systems appear to be symmetrical the particles *šte* and *ke* function differently syntactically and semantically in the two languages due to the differing degrees of grammaticalization and the interrelationship within each system vis-à-vis the *have* futures.

We may conclude with the following generalizations: in both languages the *have* futures are less grammaticalized. According to all criteria, morphological simplification, syntactic position, and semantic range, they are more verbal, preserve more of their lexical meaning of obligation and necessity. In Bulgarian, however, the negative future is formed, at least in the colloquial language exclusively with *njama*, the negated *have* future. In Macedonian, *ima/nema* is continuing to lose ground to *ke*, which has been generalized for all contexts having a meaning of expectation. In Bulgarian we see the uneven process of

grammaticalization reflected in the past vs non-past. In Bulgarian, too, we see a sharper distinction between positive and negative constructions.

We can hypothesize that the *want* future began in the SW corner of the Balkans and moved East and North. Macedonian together with Greek, Tosk Albanian, and Aromanian show the greatest degree of grammaticalization of *want* futures. Bulgarian to the east shows an earlier stage of grammaticalization along the cline outlined above. Furthermore, future contexts are the entry point, the *want* form then must have been extended to past contexts, other modal contexts and then iterative-habituals. Thus, the present study on the differing rates of grammaticalization of these verbal forms provides additional evidence for SW Macedonian as the center of contact-induced grammaticalization as proposed in other studies on contact-induced change (v. for example Friedman 1994), furthermore, a more detailed study on *want/have* futures will surely contribute a great deal to the growing literature on grammaticalization.

#### REFERENCES

- Aronson, Howard I. 1977. "The Interrelationships between Aspect and Mood in Bulgarian". *Folia Slavica* 1,1,9-32.
- Asenova, Petia. 1989. *Balkansko ezikoznanie: osnovi problemi na balkanskija ezikov sijuz*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Belyavski-Frank, Masha. 1984. "On the Status of Three Modal Auxiliaries in Balkan Slavic and Romance" in *Papers for the V. Congress of Southeast European Studies*. Columbus: Slavica.
- Bybee, Joan, William Pagliuca, and Revere D. Perkins. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- . 1991. "Back to the Future" in *Approaches to Grammaticalization, Vol II*, eds. Eliz. Traugott and Bernd Heine. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chung, Sandra and Alan Timberlake. 1985. "Tense, Aspect, and Mood," in Timothy Shopen, ed. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol.III Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fiedler, Wilfried. 1989. "Zur Arealtypologie der Futurbildung in den Balkansprachen" in *Linguistische Studien* 192. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR.
- Friedman, Victor A.. "Variation and Grammaticalization in the Development of Balkanisms," *CLS 30 Papers from the 30th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Volume 2: The Parasession on Variation in Linguistic Theory*, Katherine Beals et al. (eds.), (Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society, 1994), pp. 101-115.
- Golań, Zbigniew. 1964. *Conditionalis type balkańskiego w językach południowosłowiańskich*. Cracow: Polska Akademia Nauk.
- Hacking, Jane. 1996. "The Particle *by* and the coding of subjective meaning in Russian." Unpublished paper presented at the University of Toronto.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hunnemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Koneski, Blaže. 1967. *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturni jazik*. Skopje: Kultura.
- Koneski, Kiril. 1979. *Glagolskite konstrukcii so ke vo makedonskiot jazik*. Ph.D. dissertation. Univerzitet Kiril i Metodij, Skopje.

- Kramer, Christina E. 1994. "The Grammaticalization of the Future Tense Auxiliary in the Balkan Languages" *Indiana Slavic Studies*, Vol 7 pp. 127-135.
- Lunt, Horace. 1952. *A Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language*. Skopje: Državno Knigoizdatelstvo.
- Sandfeld, Kr. 1930. *Linguistique Balkanique*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Schaller, H.W. 1975. *Die Balkansprachen. Eine Einführung in die Balkanphilologie*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Stojanov, Stojan. 1983. *Gramatika na süvremennija bülgarski knižoven ezik. Tom 2. Morfologija*. Sofia: BAN.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Bernd Heine. 1991. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, Vol. II. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Usikova, R. 1974. "K voprosu o sisteme modal'nyx i temporal'nyx form glagola v makedonskom jazyke." *Prilozi na makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite: Oddelenie za opstestveni nauki*. 6,2/101-115.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977. "Makedonskij jazyk" *Slavjanskije jazyki*. Moscow. Moskovskij universitet.
- Vidoeski, B. Unpublished collection of dialect materials.