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 "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 state 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.
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. 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 too will go' and Geg Albanian Kam me shkue 'I have too 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. 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:

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 xuteti '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,' xuteti in its lexical meaning of 'want' has been replaced by sakam. 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 damad pismoto ucre.
*Ke ti go ucre damad 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. Vidoeskii unpublished manuscript of dialect textis) the particle may be further reduced and may occur as the affix k before vowel-initial verbs:

Gorno Sonje: Ajde spremaj, ke 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:

2 See Kramer 1994 for an overview on want futures in Balkan languages.
4 There is a negative nejkam 'I don't want' but no positive equivalent. In Bulgarian, as well, there is a conjugated verb 'sta' 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).
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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 **morit ‘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 morit, ‘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 **sütěti** has developed into a fully grammaticalized particle. It is distinct from the verb **iska ‘to want’**, it has been fully depadagogicized 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. Stijax da piša; steše da pišes.
   I would have written, you would have written.

2. Stijax da sūm xodit; steše da si xodil.
   I would have been gone, you would have been gone.

3. Deteo steše ošte včera da si napisalo dočasnite upražnenja.
   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. Note for example the variant forms of the past reported: stijal sūm da sūm donesil/steše sūm donesil.

Although constructions with ste 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 aspecral meaning of such constructions is not present in literary Bulgarian and its use is considered dialectal (Aronson 1977:26, Golab 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 dneš njama da može da dojde 'He will not be able to come today'._
_Ako si svārsēš raboratē, njama da ti trābēv da govoriš s men 'If you finish the work, you will not need to speak with me._

---

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

---
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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:

*Vlak not ne šteša 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._

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past</strong></td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>B M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indep.</td>
<td>šte ke</td>
<td>ne šte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invar.</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>volition +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it-hub</td>
<td>0 +</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-past</strong></td>
<td>indep.</td>
<td>+ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invar.</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>volition +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it-hub</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 I will cite in the table only the most usual correspondences. There are marked modal meanings which are possible, but which are irrelevant to the present discussion, e.g. the combinatory possibility of ke da/še da meaning certainty, supposition, etc. Ke da ima li godini 'He must be eleven years old.' _Toj še 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:

*Vlasti ne štite 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 dođe ‘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 decontextualized and must still be considered verbal. We see a clear division between positive have vs negative want futures in Bulgarian. The negated ne sto 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 sto 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/nima 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 thecline 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 (e.g., 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.
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