［講演］

Future Tense in South Slavic:
Diachrony and Typology[1][*]

Jasmina Grković-Major

1. Introduction

As it is universally recognized, the future is not a pure temporal concept. In relation to present or past it has a special ontological and epistemiological status, which has been known since the time of *Junggrammatiker* Hermann Paul (1970: 273–278) and Jacob Wackernagel (2009: 261). As John Lyons (1968: 310), among others, pointed out: "statements made about future occurrences are necessarily based upon speakers' beliefs, predictions or intentions, rather that upon his knowledge of 'fact'". By referring to a "future action" a speaker expresses something that he wants, expects or predicts, which ranges from an assumption to a certainty that something will happen. Thus, the category of future is close to a modal category, representing basically an intersection of mood and tense.[2] Thanks to this, modal expressions evolve into future tense and future tense in certain contexts assumes modal nuances. Because of its universal epistemiological status, futures cross-linguistically arise from a restricted set of lexical sources, which include verbs of volition, obligation, the verbs 'be', 'take', 'begin', h-possessive, venitive etc. (Jespersen 1924: 260–261; Bybee et al. 1994: 252–253; Dahl 2000: 324; Heine and Kuteva 2002: 331). They come into being through a complex process of grammaticalization, which includes a series of changes such as desemanticization, decategorialization, erosion, clitization and eventually affixation (Heine 1993: 53–58).

This paper deals with the development and typology of future tenses in South Slavic languages. The topic is partially covered in the studies dealing with Slavic futures in general (Rösler 1952; Křížková 1960; Andersen 2006) or the ones studying individual languages (Ivanova-Mirčeva 1962; Kravar 1978; Grković-Major 2013: 139–170). Our aim is to give an overall picture including new diachronic and dialectal data, and to shed more light on the role of various language contacts in the creation of South Slavic future tenses.

Our corpus consists of the texts written in vernaculars, not influenced by the Church Slavonic tradition. However, South Slavic historical corpora are of different time depth: some languages and dialects have written records from the 12th or 13th century on, like Serbian and Čakavian Croatian, which enables us to follow the development of future tenses on a large time scale and in more detail. Others, like Kajkavian Croatian, are recorded only several

centuries later. Besides, since the corpora are limited by the various extra-linguistic factors, they do not give witness to the development of all future tense forms which are documented in the present-day dialects. For instance, we have abundant Old Serbian data testifying to the rise of future tenses in the western dialects but very little from the eastern ones. This is the reason why, in order to have a broad and more accurate picture of diatopic variation, we also used data from contemporary dialects.

We will start with the description of the late Proto-Slavic situation as witnessed by Old Church Slavonic (Section 2), then analyze the development and typology of future tenses in South Slavic languages (Section 3), and finally present the causes which induced their creation (Concluding remarks).

2. Old Church Slavonic (OCS)

Being cognitively more complex than tenses denoting events within human experience, futures are the last to appear in verbal systems. Proto-Indo-European did not have a future tense (Beekes 1995: 226), using other strategies to refer to a future action or state, as shown by the oldest recorded Indo-European languages. For example, the Hittite language used a present tense with future oriented temporal adverbs (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 308). Some languages have parallels in future formations, using the suffix *s* (Indo-Iranian, Baltic, Greek).[3] The same element appears in other systems in the past tense or in verbal moods which denote an *irrealis* event. It is supposed that *s* was a deictic, meaning "there and then" as opposed to "here and now" (Gonda 1956: 28; Shields 1992: 36). As the aspectual verbal systems were developing into temporal verbal systems (see Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995: 283–286), the *s* forms were reinterpreted: in some languages they gave the past tense, and in some forms denoting non-actual and non-actualized events (future tense, verbal moods). Thus, the development of future tense belongs to the history of daughter languages.

OCS[4] did not have a future tense either, but several possibilities to refer to future events (cf. Birnbaum 1958). The first possibility was present tense. Both perfective and imperfective verbs were used, and their reference to future events was induced contextually (Křížková 1960: 21–59; Kopečný 1962). In (1), with the imperfective present tense *blažętъ*, the future-time reference is marked by the adverbial *otъ selě* 'from now on'.[5] In the Greek text (NA) we find future tense:

(1)   otъ selě *blažętъ* mę vьsi rodi (CM Lk 1:48)
        ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριοῦσίν με πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί
        'from now on all generations will call me blessed'.[6]

The futurity of perfective present tense is founded on the basic characteristic of the perfective aspect: it presents the totality of the situation denoted, without reference to its internal temporal constituency (Comrie 1976: 3). The situation is presented as a single, unanalyzable whole and cannot denote an actual, on-going event:

(2)   *damъ* ti . do polъ °csrstviě moego (CM Mr 6:23)

δώσω σοι ἕως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου

'I will give you, up to half of my kingdom'.

OCS also had several periphrastic constructions in this function: the present tense of the verbs *xotěti* 'want', *iměti* 'have', *načęti* 'begin' + infinitive and *bǫdǫ* 'be (come)' + -*l* participle. In these periphrases the verb still keeps its full form and the lexical meaning in most cases (Dostál 1954: 613; Grković-Major 2007: 389–396).

Xotěti 'want'+ infinitive is semantically ambiguous if it expresses the actions under the control of an animate subject. Such constructions can be volitive, i.e. they can express wish or intention. In such cases, we always find the verb θέλω 'wish' in Greek:

(3)   učitelju *xoštemъ* otъ tebe znamenie viděti (CM Mt 12:38)

διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἀπὸ σοῦ σημεῖον ἰδεῖν

'teacher, we wish to see a sign from you'.

Since volition and intention are future-oriented, the construction had the potential to develop into the future tense. In OCS we see only the first step in this process: desemantization. Still in the full form, it appears in new contexts, with inanimate subjects, losing its lexical meaning:

(4)   čto estъ znamenie egda *xotętъ* si *byti* (CM Lk 21:7)

καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα γίνεσθαι

'what will be the sign when these things are about to take place?'.

Iměti 'have' + infinitive is characterized by the future epistemic qualification. In other words, it denotes certainty, predestination, an event that is predicted, thus bound to happen in the future (Grković-Major 2007: 392; cf. "fatalistisches Futur", Hansen 2001: 260). In the religious discourse of the gospels it has the "full epistemic support", in other words – the highest level of conviction on the scale of epistemic modal meanings (Boye 2012: 21–23),

as in (5), which informs us about the destiny of Jesus Christ. The Greek texts support this explanation. It has the μέλλω + infinitive construction, which also denotes an event which is/ was bound to happen (Blass and Debrunner 1961: 184).

(5)   prědanъ *imatъ byti* °snъ °člvčsky vъ rǫcě °člvkomъ (CM Mt 17:22)
        μέλλει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων
        'the Son of Man is about to be delivered into the hands of men'.

Načęti 'begin' + imperfective infinitive is traditionally considered to be periphrastic future (e.g. Birnbaum 1958: 240; Stieber 1979: 241; Xaburgaev 1986: 190; Huntley 1993: 154). However, in most cases the carrier of future meaning is the perfective phasal verb *načęti*, which translates Greek future ἄρξω 'I will begin' in most cases:

(6)   togda *načьnete* °glati (CM Lk 13:26)
        τότε ἄρξεσθε λέγειν
        'then you will begin to say'.

Rarely, it renders Greek future tense, showing the beginning of the process of desemantization:

(7)   li edinogo drъžitъ sę a o drudzěemъ *neroditi načьnetъ* (CM Mt 6:24)
         ἢ ἑνὸς ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει
        'or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other'.

Another, rarely attested possibility is the 'be' future: *bǫdǫ* 'become'+ *-l* participle (Gram.: 307). The earliest testimony is in a subordinate clause, denoting a future event that precedes the one denoted in the matrix clause (*future anterior*):

(8)   prěklonitъ sę i padetъ. egda *udoblělъ bǫdetъ* ubogyimъ (PsSin 9.31)
        κύψει καὶ πεσεῖται ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν κατακυριεῦσαι τῶν πενήτων (Sept.)
        'The helpless are crushed, sink down, and fall by his might.'

In *Codex Suprasliensis*, translated at the end of the 10th or the beginning of the 11th century in the Preslav literary school, we find it in the matrix clause, as the translation of the Greek "futuristic aorist", i.e. "an aorist after a future condition" (Blass and Debrunner 1961: 17):

(9)   ašte na to sъtvorimъ vladyky *podražali bǫdemъ* (Supr. 190r.11)

        Κἂν μὲν εἰς τοῦτο χρησώμεθα, τὸν Δεσπότην ἐζηλώσαμεν

        'if we do that, we will follow the Lord'.

3. South Slavic languages

Early Slavic did not possess a grammaticalized future tense, but several competing possibilities to refer to future events instead. North Slavic had various constructions besides the perfective and imperfective present tense. Old Czech used 'want' or 'have' + infinitive, 'be' + infinitive or *-l* participle (Gebauer 1958: 425–427). Old Polish employed 'be' + infinitive or *-l* participle, and 'want', 'have' + infinitive (Grappin 1952; SSp1: 231; SSp4: 216). Polabian had 'have' and 'want' + infinitive, but no 'be' + infinitive (Lehr-Spławiński 1929: 235–236). In Old Russian charters, written in the vernacular, we find 'want', 'take', 'begin' + infinitive, rarely 'be' with participle or infinitive (Borkovskij 1949: 145–149). Old Serbian had 'want', 'have', 'take', 'begin' + infinitive, as well as 'be' + infinitive or *-l* participle (Grković-Major 2013: 139–170). The same periphrastic strategies for future-time reference were available in different areas of Slavdom.

In the centuries that came the major division was made between North and South Slavic. North Slavic has two dominant strategies: the present tense of perfective verbs and 'be' future of the imperfective ones, with the exception of Ukrainian, which also has the 'take'-type (Danylenko 2011).[7] As opposed to North Slavic, South Slavic languages today: a) have one form for both perfective and imperfective verbs, b) do not use the perfective present as future tense, except for Kajkavian Croatian and Slovene (Lencek 1982: 192), c) exhibit high diatopic variation.

3.1. The first group in the South Slavic continuum consists of Slovene and Kajkavian Croatian.[8] In the oldest Slovene historical document, the *Freising fragments*, from the late 10th century, the future is regularly expressed by the perfective present:

(10)   Togo uzego iʒpouueden *bodo* Bogu (FM III41–43)

        'Of all that I shall be confessed to God'.

In early Slovene we find several periphrases for future-time reference: 'want' + infinitive (11), 'have' + infinitive, with the same semantics as in OCS (12), and 'be' + *-l* participle (13):

(11)   onam *chocʒtſche* troſti *biti* (15th c., Mikhailov 1998: 127)

      'he will be our consolation';

(12)   *iyma priti ſodyti ſywe ynomortwe* (1362–1390, Mikhailov 1998: 99)

      'he will come to judge the living and the dead';

(13)   da *wodete* pravo Reſʒnitʒo *pouedallj* (15th–16th c., Mikhailov 1998: 186)

      'that you will say the truth'.

In the Middle Slovene period the 'be' future began to emerge in the innovative central dialects (Lencek 1982: 115). The first examples with the (*bodem* >) *bom* + *-l* participle are recorded in the mid-16th century:

(14)   muj sin...vaše grehe *bo* sam *nosil* (1551, Rupel 1966: 55)

      'my son…will carry your sins alone'.

The language of the 16th century writers mirrors the competition of several strategies (e.g. 'have' / 'want' + infinitive). However, metalinguistic factors directed further development. Bohorič's grammar from 1584 describes the future tense as the combination of *bom* + *-l* participle (Whaley 2000: 27), normatively promoting this strategy. Language prescription thus gave prominence to one of the competing possibilities, the one which was dominant in the majority of Slovene dialects.

      This is the key strategy in Slovene today, but there are also diatopic variations. For instance, the Upper Carniola dialects prefer the perfective present, and the Styria dialects the compound 'be' future (Lencek 1982: 192). The dialect of Resia in the northeast Italy, however, has the 'want' future: *ja* ćön te *ubu̯ët* (Ramovš 1928: 113). This peculiarity is most probably the result of the contacts with Friulian,[9] a Rhaeto-Romance language, which also has the 'want' analytic future.

      Kajkavian writers from the 16th and 17th century still used several possibilities: perfective present tense, 'be' + *-l* participle (*govoril budem*) or infinitive (*suditi budemo*), and 'want', both in full form and as an auxiliary, + infinitive (*hoču govoriti*, *ja ću dojti*) (Aleksić 1937: 49). Still at the end of the 19th century some dialects had both 'be' and 'want' periphrastic futures, with no difference in meaning (*bum dešal / ja ću dojti*) (Rožić 1894: 61). Present day Kajkavian uses the auxiliary *bum / bom* + *-l* participle and the perfective present.

3.2. The second South Slavic area encompasses today Croatian (except for Kajkavian) and Serbian. In Old Croatian (Čakavian) there were several strategies to convey future meaning.

The first one was the perfective present tense:

(15)   Ako car zemlji budeš, ko dobro mani *učiniš*? (16th c., Zima 1887: 247)
         'if you become the king of the land, what good will you do to me?'.

There was also a variety of periphrastic constructions: 'want', 'have'+ infinitive and 'be'+ -*l* participle or infinitive. The wide-spread possibility was 'want' + infinitive. In a collection of spiritual poems from 1380 (Vajs 1905) it prevails. The verb 'want' is found in all its 'historical stages':[10] the full form, the phonologically eroded form *hće* (16), and the clitic *će*, together with word order change, placing it after the infinitive (17):

(16)   malo *hošte* °dni *is'tešti* / sami *h'štemo* tako *lešti* (Vajs 1905: 269)
         'not many days will pass / we will lie down like that'.
(17)   m'ně bez' tebe *biti* gore *će* (Vajs 1905: 274)
         'I will be worse without you'.

         'Have' + infinitive denotes deontic obligation modality, as seen in (18), from a legal document. Since this meaning is future oriented, the periphrasis also has future time reference:

(18)   v keh se udržaše, da tu crekvu *ima* komun barbanski *obsluževati* vsakimi potribami
         (1275, Šurmin 1898: 44)
         'which contained that the community of Barban has to (> will) supply that church with all it needs'.

It renders also future epistemic qualification:
(19)   Mečem mojim *nakazati* te *imam* (16th c., Zima 1887: 300)
         'I will punish you (for sure) with my sword'.

'Be'-future with -*l* participle (20) was used in dependent clauses, while 'be' + infinitive is found in matrix clauses as well (21):

(20)   kako e *budete* sada *videli* (1275, Šurmin 1898: 21)
         'as you will see it now';
(21)   drakunь *будеть se vraćati* (1380, Vajs 1905: 261)
         'the dragon will be coming back'.

The appearance of the 'be' + infinitive future might shed new light on the development of

the same type of future in North Slavic and contribute to the long-lasting discussion about its origin. This could be an internal development, since Dalmatian, a Romance language with which the Čakavian speakers were in close contact, did not have this type of future tense (see Maiden 2016: 131). This feature links Čakavian with Kajkavian, where 'be' + infinitive is historically recorded, including the testimonies from transitional speeches (Kapetanović 2013: 166).[11]

Today the only or the prevailing strategy is the 'want' future, while in Čakavian dialects the "use of the perfective present with future reference, if it occurs at all, is at best exceedingly rare" (Vermeer 1982: 327).

In Old Serbian[12] the perfective present tense is not attested in independent clauses. The main construction for expressing future-time reference is 'want' + infinitive. Already in the mid-13th c. the verb 'want' went through the process of grammaticalization, giving the auxiliary: *hoću > hću* (22) *> ću* (23):

(22)   obĕtuju se...kako *hću ljubiti* vьsь grad (1267–68, PP 28.2–6)
        'I promise...that I will love the whole city'.
(23)   ne mogu toga vьsega ispisati ... počto *ke* moi člověkь *govoriti* (1252–54, PP 25.19–20)
        'I cannot write all of that ... because my man will talk'.

The competition of the full form and the auxiliary lasted for some time.[13] As pointed out by Heine (1993: 48), "when ... we are concerned with stages of development then we have to be aware that these 'stages' merely represent certain points, perhaps focal points, along the relevant continuum; they are in no way suggestive of discrete entities".

In the 15th century we witness the first examples with word order change, with the auxiliary becoming an enclitic (*će dati > dati će*), then an affix with the removal of the infinitive ending (*činiti će > činiće*). The universal cycle of grammaticalization was thus completed: lexical word > grammatical word (auxiliary) > affix:

(24)   oni prěsvětli gospodinь dužь i općina bnetačьka *dati će* i činiće davati (1423, PP 337.75–76)
        'his majesty lord duke and the Venetian municipality will give and will make give'.

In the earliest period the periphrasis 'have' + infinitive was used for epistemic qualification, future certainty, just as in OCS, Old Slovene and Old Croatian:

(25)   kto hoće sije potvoriti . ne malь gněvь i nakazanije *ima vьsprijeti* ot kralevьstva mi (1234, PP 13. 31–33)

'whoever wants to transgress this will (for sure) receive My Majesty's wrath and punishment'.

The construction was highly 'context sensitive', often having fuzzy meaning between epistemic modality, deontic modality and future reference. In some cases, it is impossible to discern these meanings, since the governing verb never went through the process of grammaticalization and behaves like a quasi-auxiliary (see Heine 1993: 14–16).

In the eastern dialects 'be'+ -*l* participle was used only in dependent clauses. It refers to an action/state anterior to the one expressed by the matrix clause predicate, be it in the future (*future anterior* (26)) or the past (*past anterior* (27)), putting its result in focus:

(26)   i što *bude pakostilь* . da platimo (1247, PP 24.27)

'and for whatever damage he would do, we should pay';

(27)   onomuzi da poda trьgov'cu cěnu što *bude podalь* za njega (1349, PP 66.96–98)

'he should pay the merchant the amount of money which he gave for it'.

In the western dialects it is rarely attested as future tense in dependent clauses:

(28)   obetovahь se .... za moju bratьju...da *budu prisegli* (1442, PP 688.92–94)

'I promised...for my brothers...that they would swear'.

'Be' + infinitive appears initially only in dependent clauses, as *future anterior.* The first examples are from the late 14th century:

(29)   kade se *bude* testamenatь *otvoriti* i *pročtěti* da se upišu podь onzi listь (1466, PP 750. 19–20)

'when the will is opened and read they should sign that document'.

In the later period it is attested as future tense in independent sentences, mostly in the western dialects:

(30)   sve s prva jes novo, nu s ljetim *bude uzrit* (16th c., Zima 1887: 295)

'everything is new at the beginning but it will mature in years'.

In the oldest Old Serbian documents there were two more nascent strategies, which were early abandoned: 'take' + infinitive (Miklosich 1868–74: 864–865) and 'begin' + infinitive (Ružičić 1979):[14]

(31)   da vi ga damъ ako vi *ime* što *pakostiti* iz moe zemle (around 1215, PP 4.7–8)
        'may I give him to you if he would do damage to you from my land';
(32)   žito i vino koe se *načne prodavati* u gradě (1254, PP 22.16–17)
        'the wheat and wine which will be sold in the city'.

Today, the 'want' future is the dominant strategy in Serbian and Croatian (except for Kajkavian). It exhibits high diatopic diversity in Serbian, the main division being between the speeches which preserve the infinitive and the ones that have *da* + present tense instead. However, in some of them (e.g. in the Kosovo-Resava dialect), both strategies are still in competition: a) 'want' aux.pers. + infinitive: *ja ću radit*, b) 'want' aux.pers. + *da* + present tense: *oni će da idu* (Božović 2008: 262–263).

Besides that, some Kosovo-Resava and Herzegovina-Krajina vernaculars developed the 'have' future tense: *ima da nađemo* (e.g. Pavlović 1974: 74; also Stanić 1977: 115), and in the Herzegovina-Krajina speeches in western Bosnia the 'be' + -*l* participle future tense is attested as well: *budu te ubili* (Petrović 1973: 172).

3.3. The last South Slavic area encompasses the Serbian Prizren-Timok dialect, Bulgarian and Macedonian. However, the speeches of the Prizren-Timok dialect, which entered the Balkan Sprachbund or were subjected to its innovation waves, represent a transitional zone. Unfortunately, historical sources do not testify to the rise of future tense in these vernaculars. Contemporary speeches exhibit areal gradience of several possibilities, some of them overlapping: a) 'want' aux.pers. + *da* + present tense: *ću da pišem*, b) 'want'aux.pers. + present tense: *ću pišem*, c) 'want' part. + *da* + present tense: *će da pišem*, d) 'want' part. + present tense: će *pišem* (Topolinjska 1994: 151). The same cline is seen in the speech of the Serbian dialect of Gallipoli, although it probably happened under different circumstances (Ivić 1994: 254–256).[15] The competiton of two or more strategies characterizes many speeches today (e.g. Bogdanović 1979: 83; Marković 2000: 176; Vukadinović 1996: 222). According to the existing dialectological studies, the negated future has only the verb 'want' (e.g. Tomić 1984: 93; Bogdanović 1979: 83; Bogdanović 1987: 199), even in the area neighbouring with Macedonian: *ne će rabotam* (Mladenović 2001: 432).

The first periphrasis used for future time reference in Bulgarian was the 'want' + infinitive construction. The governing verb went early through the process of grammaticalization (*hoštet > šte(t)*):

(33)   i milosti *ne šte (i)měti* (n)ǫ velik(ǫ) (i)mae orgiǫ patiti ot °crsmi (1230, GBC: 30)
         'and will not have mercy but will suffer (for sure) great wreath from My Majesty'.

In the later period the infinitive got shortened and was eventually replaced by *da* + present tense. The stages the future tense formation went through in the history of Bulgarian might be presented as follows: a) 'want'.present tense + infinitive: *hošteši viděti*, b) 'want'.aux.pers. + infinitive (> shortened): *šteš videti > vide(t)*, c) 'want'.aux.pers. + *da* + present tense: *šteš da vidiš*, d) 'want'.part. + *da* + present tense: *šte*[16] *da vidiš*, e) 'want'.part. + present tense: *šte vidiš*; the last stage was reached in 14th/15th c., at least in the part of Bulgarian dialects and the most progressive ones were the western Bulgarian speeches (Haralampiev 2001: 148–149).

Stage a) is the initial periphrasis, while in stage b) 'want' gave an auxiliary, first with full and then with shortened infinitive. In stage c) the infinitive was replaced by *da* + present tense, because they belong to the same conceptual domain: *irrealis*.[17] In stage d) the declinable auxiliary became redundant since a grammatical person was marked in the present tense. The result was stage e), with the indeclinable particle *šte* as the marker of future tense. If we compare these stages with the areal gradience in the Serbian Prizren-Timok dialect, it is obvious that diatopic variations mirror these diachronic stages, depending on their closeness to the focal point of the Balkan future tense innovation. This emphasizes the need for cooperation between dialectology and historical linguistics, as already pointed out by dialectologists (Miloradović 2007: 359).

The next construction was 'have' + infinitive. Its early function was as in the other early South Slavic languages. It rendered a future epistemic qualification (certainty), as seen in (33): *(i)mae orgiǫ patiti* 'will suffer (for sure) great wreath'. Although the affirmative construction was well-preserved in such formulaic expressions, the written sources testify to its gradual disappearance (Ivanova-Mirčeva 1962: 90, 96). On the other hand, it was preserved in the negated form, being subjected to the further development: *ne imam > njamam > njama* (for all persons), followed by *da* + present tense: *ne imatь iziti > njama da izljaza* (Ivanova-Mirčeva 1962: 96). Thus, the general picture of the contemporary Bulgarian is a split 'want' (affirmative) vs. 'have' (negated) system. *Ima*-futures and *ne šte*-futures have a restricted usage, being characteristic for the spoken language (Haralampiev 2006: 392). Bulgarian also

exhibits diatopic variations. For example, in some western dialects *da* is omitted in the negated future: *nema se tropne*, which testifies to the last stage in the development of this future tense type (Haralampiev 2001: 149); the speeches in the central and northwestern Bulgaria as well as the Bulgarian speeches in Romania regularly have just the 'have' future: *ima da igraem* (Cyxun 1981: 161) etc.

The Macedonian language developed the same type of the 'have'-future. The initial periphasis with infinitive gave 'want'.part. + present tense: *ḱe*[18] *čitam* (Koneski 1986: 201). In the standard Macedonian we have the 'want' future in affirmative sentences (*ḱe čitam*), but the competiton of 'want' and 'have' futures in the negated ones (*ne ḱe čitam / nema da čitam*) (Minova Ǵurkova 2006: 173). According to Cyxun (1981: 175–176) all Macedonian dialects have the negated 'have future': *nema da idu*. Macedonian exhibits diatopic variations as well. For instance, some speeches in the northern area form the affirmative future tense with the verb 'have': *imat da kreva* (Cyxun 1981: 161).

4. Concluding remarks

The internal language motivation in Slavic, as in all Indo-European languages, was the transformation of an earlier aspectual verbal system to a temporal verbal system. This long-lasting and gradual process started already in the proto-language and encompassed the history of individual daughter languages and their daughter languages as well. For instance, present, aorist and perfect tense were created in Proto-Indo-European, Proto-Slavic witnessed the emergence of the imperfect tense, analytical perfect and pluperfect, while the formation of future tense belongs to the history of the individual Slavic languages.

South Slavic languages inherited several Proto-Slavic patterns for future-time reference, and they were in competition for centuries. In the choice between the various possibilities, language contacts played a role by promoting one of them (cf. Ivanova-Mirčeva 1962: 181; Cyxun 1981: 160).

The northwest area, today encompassing Slovene and Kajkavian Croatian, witnessed the birth of 'be'+ *-l* participle future tense as the dominant strategy. This was an indigenous Slavic construction, but its promotion in the majority of dialects might have been triggered by language contacts with German. These contacts were long-lasting: today's Slovenia was ruled by the Holy Roman Empire for almost 1000 years and between the mid-14th century and 1918 most of Slovenia was under the Habsburg monarchy. As a result, "Slovene proves to be a language that was strongly under the influence of German" (Lipavic Oštir 2010: 48). The Kajkavian Croatian territories were also part of the Habsburg empire for more than three

centuries.

In Old and Middle High German there were several constructions for future-time reference, among them *werden* 'become' + perfect participle, especially frequent in the southern dialects, Bavarian and Swabian (see Kurrelmeyer 1904), with which Slovene and Kajkavian were in contact. The structure of the German and Slavic constructions is analogous: a) German *werden* is an inchoative verb, while the perfect participle had a resultative meaning, and b) PS *$b\rho d\rho$ denoted a change of state in the domain of *irrealis*, and the -*l* participle originally had a resultative meaning as well (Grković-Major 2013: 157–158). We might assume that the contacts with German promoted one of the competing inherent Slavic strategies. This was supported internally by the whole system of analytic forms with the verb 'be' (perfect, pluperfect, conditional).

This innovation wave reached at least part of Old Croatian Čakavian and the western Old Serbian dialects. The Slovene-Kajkavian-Čakavian continuum was disrupted by the arrival of Štokavian migrants during and after the Ottoman occupation, from the 15th c. on. Thus, Čakavian did not participate further in the Slovene-Kajkavian generalization of the 'be' + -*l* participle future and it was confined to dependent clauses.

Language contacts with Greek and Romance varieties in the Balkans reinforced two other inherent Slavic possibilities: 'want' and 'have' futures. The first type is often ascribed to the Greek and the second one to the Romance influence (Sandfeld 1930: 180–185). We would agree with Asenova (2002: 211–212) that in both cases we are most probably dealing with polygenesis.

There must have been two sources promoting the 'want' future: 1) language contacts with the Byzantine Greek which had 'want' + infinitive, in the east, and 2) language contacts with Dalmatian Romance varieties, which had the same periphrasis as one of the nascent possibilities (Bartoli 1906: 424). This innovation gained pace in Croatian Čakavian after it lost ties with the Slovene-Kajkavian continuum. Today, it is a dominant strategy in Croatian (except for Kajkavian) and in Serbian, where it exhibits high diatopic variation ('want' + infinitive / *da* + present tense). In Bulgarian, Macedonian and the Serbian Prizren-Timok dialect, thanks to the loss of the infinitive, it was subjected to further development: the creation of the Balkan future type: particle + present tense.

The rise of the 'have'-future was reinforced by: 1) the contacts with Greek, where the 'have' construction expressed future certainty, just as in early South Slavic, and 2) contacts with the speakers of the Romance varieties, which developed the same pattern, *cantare habeo* 'I have to sing', into future tense. Not only that this was one of the Vulgar Latin strategies, but a comparison reveals a diachronic similarity between Romance and Slavic. According

to Benveniste (1968), the Latin construction was first used to indicate "predestination of the object to follow a certain course of events", i.e. certainty, then it was used in dependent clauses, and finally as future tense in matrix clauses—and this is the exact developmental path we saw in South Slavic. The wide area of the historical use of this future type correlates with the area once inhabited by the Romance population. In Balkan linguistics, this future type is considered to be a Balkan Slavic feature. But if we look into South Slavic language history beyond Balkan Slavic, we see that the area of this isogloss was much broader in the past. It has been in competition with the 'want' type for centuries, gradually bring restricted. Today it is mostly confined to Bulgarian and Macedonian languages, which share the split 'want'/'have' system with some Aromanian dialects, Balkan Romani and West Rumelian Turkish, with which they were in contact (Friedman 2008: 133). Having in mind that northern Albanian dialects (Geg) predominantly use the 'have' future, while the southern ones (Tosk) predominantly use the 'want' type (Demiraj 1994: 132), it is clear that the two types are still in competition not only in Bulgarian and Macedonian but in other Balkan languages as well, with the 'want' type spreading (cf. Cyxun 1981: 162). The only exception seems to be the Serbian Prizren-Timok dialect, in which the split 'want'/'have' system is not attested.

In conclusion: the creation of future tenses in South Slavic is the result of an interplay between language internal and contact-induced phenomena. When new grammatical categories emerge, languages go through a period of instability, with several internal strategies in competition. In such a situation language contacts may influence the choice of one of the existing possibilities, reinforcing its grammaticalization.

Abbreviations

Lk   The Gospel according to Luke

Mr   The Gospel according to Mark

Mt   The Gospel according to Matthew

Notes

[1] This paper is the result of the work on the project "History of the Serbian language" (№ 178001), financed by the Serbian Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development.

[2] A language can have one grammaticalized form to denote different levels of conviction that an event will happen, which makes it closer to a deictic category. In English, for example, one form expresses full conviction based on scientific knowledge (*The next ice age will be in 60,000 years*), a religious system (*The righteous will go to heaven*) or an assumption based on available information (*He will come tomorrow*), etc. On the other side, in languages like Turkish there are several forms

to express a level of conviction and a type of knowledge (Yavaş 1982: 420), which makes them closer to the category of epistemic modality.

3   Based on a presumption that Proto-Indo-European had future tense with this formant, it was long thought that Proto-Slavic had it as well (e.g. Vaillant 1966: 105). However, it is not attested in OCS, and the only possible remnant would be the Russian Church Slavonic "future participle" *byšaštijь* (SRJa I: 368). However, O. Szemerényi argues that this is a late innovation based on the aorist form *byšę*, having not only a future but a preterite meaning 'having become' as well (Semeren'i 1980: 304; cf. Stepanov 1981: 114; Danylenko 2015: 531). See also Birnbaum 1995.

4   Although we have only 10th and 11th century copies of the original translations, the language was preserved to a high degree since those were religious texts, whose structure could not be intentionally modified. Although influenced by Greek in the process of translation, OCS preserved inherent Slavic features in the domain of the verbal system, thus representing the situation not long before the end of Proto-Slavic and the rise of individual Slavic languages.

5   Thanks to the nature of imperfective present tense, we find the same possibility in contemporary Slavic, e.g. Serbian *Sutra idem u Beograd* 'I am going to Belgrade tomorrow'.

6   English translation is given according to ESV.

7   This is a general, thus necessarily simplified typological survey. It gives the situation in the literary languages and the majority of dialects. The picture however gets more complicated if we include all diatopic variations. For example, the 'take'-type is found in the Russian dialects as well (SRNG12: 190).

8   While using the names of Slavic languages, we have to bear in mind that they form a continuum of dialects, in which sometimes the identification of a dialect as belonging to language A or B relies not on linguistic facts but on the national identity of its speakers. Because of this, according to Ivić (1991: 169), South Slavic languages should always be studied as a whole. As Kapović (2017: 608), writing on the position of Kajkavian, recently pointed out, "the problem of the relationship between Slovene and Kajkavian is in many ways not at all a question of linguistics and dialectology but of politics, ethnicity and identity". This can also be applied to the relation of Serbian and Croatian, Serbian and Bulgarian, Bulgarian and Macedonian.

9   Steenwijk (1992: 1) writes that Resian was influenced by Friulian, Venetian and Italian.

10 This is understandable since the poems might originate from different periods.

11 Čakavian, which is today confined mostly to the Croatian coastal area and islands, was historically situated deep in the continent, bordering with Kajkavian.

12 Description of the Old Serbian situation is given according to: Grković-Major 2013: 139–170.

13 In the charters from the 12th–15th century the full form was regular in formulaic sequences, such as oaths, found in peace treaties. This is explained by the fact that formulaic language could not be changed and was preserved by repetition, thus sometimes exhibiting archaic features, long gone from the vernacular. This reminds us that in dealing with corpora we always have to take into account in which part of a document an example is found, and to which register it belongs.

[14] It is worthwhile to notice that these two strategies were thought to be specific only for early East Slavic.

[15] The speakers of this dialect left Serbia at the end of the 16th–beginning of the 17th century, and moved to the Gallipoli peninsula, in the Turkish part of Thracia, where they were in intensive contacts with Greeks, Bulgarians, Turks. In the 20th century they settled in today's Macedonia. In mid-20th century, when Pavle Ivić examined their speech, they still had the synthetic 'want' future, which shows that they left Serbia with it. In the language contact situation they developed variants 1), 3) and 4).

[16] The particle appears in various phonological forms: *ča, še, ša, žъ, šъ* etc. (see BD).

[17] It is shown by their origin: the Slavic infinitive developed from a dative of a verbal noun, thus being future oriented; *da* is an optative particle by origin, expressing a wish. This brings us to another issue in historical linguistics: in morphological replacements such as this one, both means, the old and the new one, have to be from the same conceptual domain.

[18] The particle appears in various phonological forms: *ḱe, ḱa, ḱi, ka, šte, ža, za* etc. (Vidoeski 2000: 173).

References

Aleksić, Radomir. 1937. Prilozi istoriji kajkavskog dijalekta. *Južnoslovenski filolog* XVI: 1–99.

Andersen, Henning. 2006. Periphrastic futures in Slavic. Divergence and convergence. In: Kerstin Eksell and Thora Vinther (eds.) *Change in verbal systems. Issues on explanation*, 9–45. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Asenova, Petja. 2002. *Balkansko ezikoznanie. Osnovnija problemi na Balkanskija ezikov săjuz*. Veliko Tărnovo: Faber.

Bartoli, Matteo Giulio. 1906. *Das Dalmatische, II*. Wien: Alfred Hölder.

BD: *Karta na dialektnata delitba na bălgarskija ezik.* http://ibl.bas.bg//bulgarian_dialects/ [accessed February 2018]

Beekes, Robert S. P. 1995. *Comparative Indo-European linguistics. An introduction*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Benveniste, Émile. 1968. Mutations of linguistic categories. In: Winfred P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel (eds.) *Directions for historical linguistics: A symposium.* http://www.utexas.edu/cola/centers/lrc/books/hist04.html [accessed January 2018]

Birnbaum, Henrik. 1958. *Untersuchungen zu den Zukunftsumschreibung mit dem Infinitiv im Altkirchenslavischen*. Stockholm (Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Études de

philologie slave 6).

Birnbaum, David. 1995. The Church Slavonic future participle from a comparative perspective. *Die Welt der Slaven* XL/1: 76–92.

Blass, F. and A. Debrunner. 1961. *A Greek grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Bogdanović, Nedeljko. 1979. Govori Bučuma i Belog Potoka. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* XXV: 1–178.

Bogdanović, Nedeljko. 1987. Govori Aleksinačkog Pomoravlja. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* XXXIII: 7–302.

Borkovskij, V. I. 1949. *Sintaksis drevnerusskix gramot* (*Prostoe predloženie*). L'vov: Izdanie L'vovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.

Boye, Kasper. 2012. *Epistemic meaning: A crosslinguistic and functional-cognitive study*. Berlin & NewYork: De Gruyter Mouton.

Božović, Marinko. 2008. *Govori srednjega Ibra*. Priština/Leposavić: Institut za proučavanje kulture Srba na Kosovu i Metohiji.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar. Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

CM: V. Jagić (ed.) 1960. *Codex Marianus Glagoliticus*. Graz: Akademische Druck/U. Verlagsanstalt [Berlin, 1883].

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect. An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cyxun, G. A. 1981. *Tipologičeskie problemi balkanoslavjanskogo jazykovogo arèala*. Minsk: Nauka i texnika.

Dahl, Östen. 2000. The grammar of future time reference in European languages. In: Östen Dahl (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, 309–328. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Danylenko, Andrii. 2011. Is there any inflectional future in East Slavic? A case of Ukrainian against Romance reopened. In: Nomachi Motoki (ed.) *Grammaticalization in Slavic languages*, 147–177. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center.

Danylenko, Andrii. 2015. The chicken or the egg? Onomatopoeic particles and verbs in Baltic and Slavic. In: Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet and Björn Wiemer (eds.) *Contemporary approaches to Baltic linguistics*, 523–542. Berlin & Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

Demiraj, Šaban. 1994. *Balkanska lingvistika*. Skopje: Logos-A.

Dostál, Antonín. 1954. *Studie o vidovém systému v staroslověnštině*. Praha: Státní pedagogické

nakladatelství.

ESV: *English standard version.* https://www.biblestudytools.com/esv/ [accessed November 2018]

FM: *Brižinski spomeniki. Monumenta Frisingensia.* http://nl.ijs.si/e-zrc/bs/index-en.html [accessed March 2018]

Friedman, Victor A. 2008. Balkan Slavic dialectology and Balkan linguistics: Periphery as center. In: Christina Y. Bethin (ed.) *American contributions to the 14th International congress of Slavists, Ohrid, September 2008. Vol. 1: Linguistics*, 131–48. Bloomington: Slavica.

Gamkrelidze, T. V. and Vjač. Vs. Ivanov. 1995. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: A reconstruction and historical analysis of a proto-language and a proto-culture*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

GBC: Angelina Daskalova and Marija Rajkova. 2015. *Gramoti na bălgarskite care*. Sofija: BAN.

Gebauer, Jan. 1958. *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého. Díl III: Tvarosloví, II. Časování*. Praha: ČAV.

Gonda, Jan. 1956. *The character of Indo-European moods*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Grappin, Henri. 1952. Le verbe «vouloir» dans l'expression du futur en polonais. *Revue des études slaves* 29/1–4: 7–15.

Gram.: Ivan Duridanov (red.) 1993. *Gramatika na starobălgarskija ezik. Fonetika. Morfologija. Sintaksis*. Sofija: BAN.

Grković-Major [Mejdžor], Jasmina. 2007. *Spisi iz istorijske lingvistike*. Sremski Karlovci & Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.

Grković-Major [Mejdžor], Jasmina. 2013. *Istorijska lingvistika. Kognitivno-tipološke studije*. Sremski Karlovci & Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.

Hansen, Björn. 2001. *Das slavische Modalauxiliar. Semantik und Grammatikalisierung im Rusischen, Polnischen, Serbischen/Kroatischen und Altkirchenslavischen*. München: Verlag Otto Sagner.

Haralampiev, Ivan. 2001. *Istoričeska gramatika na bălgarskija ezik*. Veliko Tărnovo: Faber.

Haralampiev, Ivan. 2006. *Po vekovnite păteki na bălgarskija ezik. Izabrani prinosi*. Veliko Tărnovo: Faber.

Heine, Bernd. 1993. *Auxiliaries. Cognitive forces and grammaticalization*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: University Press.

Hoffner, Harry A. Jr. and Craig H. Melchert. 2008. *A grammar of the Hittite language*, *1: Reference grammar*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Huntley, David. 1993. Old Church Slavonic. In: Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbet (eds.) *The Slavonic languages*, 125–187.

Ivanova-Mirčeva, Dora. 1962. *Razvoj na bădešte (futurum) v bălgarskija ezik ot X do XVIII vek*. Sofija: BAN.

Ivić, Pavle. 1991. *Izabrani ogledi I. O slovenskim jezicima i dijalektima*. Niš: Prosveta.

Ivić, Pavle. 1994. *O govoru Galipoljskih Srba* (prir. D. Petrović). Celokupna dela (red. M. Radovanović). I. Sremski Karlovci & Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.

Jespersen, Otto. 1924. *The philosophy of grammar*. London: George Allen & Unwin LTD.

Kapetanović, Amir. 2013. Dijatopijske varijacije starohrvatske književne čakavštine. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 18: 163–174.

Kapović, Mate. 2017. The position of Kajkavian in the South Slavic dialect continuum in light of old accentual isoglosses. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 62/4: 606–620.

Koneski, Blaže. 1986. *Istorija na makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje: Kultura.

Kopečný, Fr. 1962. Zur Entstehung der Futurbedetung beim perfektiven Präsens im Slavischen. *Scando-Slavica* VIII: 171–181.

Kravar, Miroslav. 1978. Zur Futurperiphrase budem + Infinitiv im Serbokroatischen. In: Johannes Holthusen, Wolfgang Kasack and Olesch Reinhold (eds.) *Slavistische Studien zum VIII. internationalen Slavistenkongress in Zagreb 1978*. Köln & Wien: Böhlau-Verlag, 255–263.

Křížková, Helena. 1960. *Vývoj opisného futura v jazycích slovanských, zvláště v ruštině*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Kurrelmeyer, Herman.1904. *The historical development of the forms of the future tense in Middle High German*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.

Lehr-Spławiński, Tadeusz. 1929. *Gramatyka połabska*. Lwów: Nakład K. S. Jakubowskiego.

Lencek, Rado. 1982. *The structure and history of the Slovene language.* Columbus: Slavica.

Lipavic Oštir, Alja. 2010. Grammaticalization and language contact between German and Slovene. In: Nomachi Motoki (ed.) *Grammaticalization in Slavic languages: From an areal and typological perspective*, 27–48. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center.

Lyons, John. 1968. *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maiden, Martin. 2016. Dalmatian. In: Adam Ledgeway and Maiden Martin (eds.) *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*, 126–138. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marković, Jordana. 2000. Govor Zaplanja. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* XLVII: 7–307.

Mikhailov, Nikolai. 1998. *Frühslowenische Sprachdenkmäler: Die handschriftliche Periode der slowenischen Sprache (XIV. Jh. bis 1550)*. Leiden: Brill & Rodopi. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40997740 [accessed January 2018]

Miklosich, Fr. 1868–1874. *Vergleichende Syntax der slavischen Sprachen*. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller.

Miloradović, Sofija. 2007. Dijahroni i sinhroni aspekt analitičkih pojava u srpskim narodnim govorima. *Zbornik Matice srpske za slavistiku* 71–72: 357–375.

Minova Ǵurkova, Liljana. 2006. *Gramatika na makedonskiot standarden jazik za stranci*. Skopje: Univerzitet „Sv. Kiril i Metodij”.

Mladenović, Radivoje. 2001. Govor šarplaninske župe Gora. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* XLVIII: 1–606.

NA: *Novum Testamentum Graece*. http://www.academic-bible.com/en/online-bibles/about-the-online-bibles/ [accessed January 2018]

Paul, Hermann. 1970. *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Pavlović, Milivoj. 1970. *Govor Janjeva. Međudijalekatski i miksoglotski procesi*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

Petrović, Dragoljub. 1973. *O govoru Zmijanja*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.

PP: Ljub, Stojanović. 1929, 1934. *Stare srpske povelje i pisma* I/1–2. Beograd: SANU.

PsSin: Sergěi Severьjanovъ. 1922. *Sinajskaja psaltyrь*. Petrogradъ: Izdanie otdělenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti RAN.

Ramovš, Fran. 1928. Karakteristika slovenskega narečja v Reziji. *Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino* 4: 107–121. http://abaoaqu.maldura.unipd.it:8081/resianica/slv/ramkarak.do [accessed March 2018]

Rožić, Vatroslav. 1884. Kajkavački dijalekat u Prigorju. *Rad JAZU* CXVIII: 55–115.

Rösler, Karl. 1952. Beobachtungen und Gedanken über das analytische Futurum im Slavischen. *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 2: 103–149.

Rupel, Mirko. 1966. *Slovenski protestantski pisci*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.

Ružičić, Gojko. 1979. An Old Serbian verbal construction. *Folia Slavica* 3/1–2: 210–215.

Sandfeld, Kr. 1930. *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats*. Paris: Librarie C. Klincksieck.

Semeren'i, O. 1980. *Vvedenie v sravniteљnoe jazykoznanie*. Moskva: Progress.

Sept.: *Septuagint (LXX)* https://www.academic-bible.com/en/online-bibles/septuagint-lxx/read-the-bible-text/ [accessed January 2018]

Shields, Keneth C. 1992. *A history of Indo-European verb morphology*. Amsterdam &

Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

SRJa: *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv., 1 (A–B)* (gl. red. S. G. Barxudarov). 1975. Moskva: Nauka.

SRNG12: *Slovar' russkix narodnyx govorov, 12: Zubrëxa–Kalumagi* (red. F. P. Filin). 1977. Leningrad: Nauka.

SSp1: *Słownik staropolski, Tom I: A–Ć* (red. Stanisław Urbańczyk). 1953–1955. Warszawa: PAN.

SSp4: *Słownik staropolski, Tom IV: L–M* (red. Stanisław Urbańczyk). 1963–1965. Warszawa: PAN.

Stanić, Milija. 1977. *Uskočki govor II. Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* XXII: 1–157.

Steenwijk, Han. 1992. *The Slovene dialect of Resia San Giorgio*. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.

Stepanov, Jurij S. 1981. Balto-slavjanskij in"junktiv i sigmatičeskie formy. *Baltistica* 17(2): 112–125.

Stieber, Zdzisław. 1979. *Zarys gramatyki porównawczej języków słowiańskich*. Warszawa: PWN.

Supr.: *Codex Suprasliensis* http://suprasliensis.obdurodon.org/ [accessed January 2018]

Šurmin, Đuro. 1898. *Hrvatski spomenici, sv. I. (od godine 1100–1499)*. Zagreb: JAZU.

Tomić, Mile. 1984. Govor Sviničana. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* XXX: 7–265.

Topolinjska, Zuzana. 1994. Infinitiv vs *da*-subjunktiv u formuli *velle*-futura. In: *Govori prizrensko-timočke oblasti i susednih dijalekata* (Zbornik radova sa naučnog skupa, Niška Banja, juna 1992). Niš: Univerzitet u Nišu, Filozofski fakultet & Institut za srpski jezik SANU & Centar za naučna istraživanja SANU i Univerziteta u Nišu, 149–160.

Vaillant André. 1966. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome III: Le verbe*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.

Vajs, Josip. 1905. Starohrvatske duhovne pjesme. *Starine* XXXI: 258–275.

Vermeer, Willem. 1982. On the principal sources for the study of Čakavian dialects with neocircumflex in adjectives and *e*-presents. *Studies in Slavic and general linguistics. Vol. 2: South Slavic and Balkan linguistics*, 279–340.

Vidoeski, Božidar, 2000. *Prašalnik za sobiranje material za makedonskiot dialekten atlas, Makedonski dialekten atlas* 1. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik „Krste Misirkov".

Vukadinović, Vilotije. 1996. Govor Crne Trave i Vlasine. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* XLII: 1–317.

Wackernagel, Jacob. 2009. *Lectures on syntax, with special reference to Greek, Latin and*

Germanic (edited with notes and bibliography by David Langslow). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whaley, Marika Lynn. 2000. The evolution of the Slavic 'be(come)'-type compound future. Unpublished doctoral disertation, Ohio State University.

Xaburgaev, G. A. 1986². *Staroslavjanskij jazyk*. Moskva: Prosveščenie.

Yavaş, Feryal. 1982. Future reference in Turkish. *Linguistics* 20: 411–429.

Zima, Luka. 1887. Ńekoje, većinom sintaktične razlike između čakavštine, kajkavštine i štokavštine. *Djela JAZU* VII: 1–343.

Футур у јужнословенским језицима:
дијахронија и типологија

Јасмина Грковић-Мејџор

У раду се разматрају развој и типологија футура у јужнословенским језицима, на корпусу вернакуларних докумената, од најстаријих сачуваних споменика до савремених дијалеката. Посебна пажња посвећена је односу унутарјезичких развојних тенденција и језичких контаката у формирању овог глаголског облика.

Унутарјезичка мотивација у словенским, као и у осталим индоевропским језицима, била је трансформација ранијег аспектуалног глаголског система у темпорални вербални систем. Овај дуготрајни процес, који је започео у праиндоевропском, обухватио је и историју посебних језика. Како сведочи старословенски, прасловенски језик није имао футур, већ више могућности за упућивање на будућу радњу: презент, *xotěti 'хтети', *iměti 'имати', *načęti 'почети' + инфинитив, као и *bǫdǫ 'постати' + -l партицип. Овакво стање наследили су и рани словенски језици.

У јужнословенским језицима је образовање футура било градуелан процес, у којем су језички контакти утицали на промовисање једне од изворно словенских стратегија за означавање будуће радње. Промоција футура од глагола 'постати' са -l партиципом, као доминантне стратегије у северозападној области, која данас обухвата словеначки и хрватски кајкавски, могла је бити подстакнута контактима са немачким језиком. У старо- и средњевисоконемачком једна од конструкција за исказивање будуће радње/стања била је перифраза werden 'постати' + партицип перфекта, фреквентна управо у баварском и швапском, са којима су говорници словеначког и хрватског кајкавског били у дуготрајном контакту.

Језички контакти са грчким и романским варијететима на Балкану оснажили су две друге изворно словенске стратегије: футур са 'хтети' и 'имати', и у оба случаја се, по свему судећи, ради о полигенези. Граматикализација футура са помоћним глаголом 'хтети' обухватила је српски, хрватски (осим кајкавског) и источнојужнословенске језике. У бугарском и македонском је, захваљујући губљењу инфинитива, футур био подвргнут даљем развоју, тј. стварању балканског типа: партикула + презент. Говори југоисточне Србије у извесном смислу представљају прелазну зону, са дијатопијским варијацима, које се у многима јављају као конкурентна средства у истом говору. Футур са глаголом 'имати' историјски је потврђен на широком терену, не само бугарских и

македонских већ и хрватских (изузимајући кајкавски) и српских дијалеката, и дуго је био у конкуренцији са 'хтети' футуром, да би временом бивао потискиван. Данас је ограничен на негирани футур у бугарском и македонском језику, који се у овом погледу разликују од дијалеката југоисточне Србије, у којима се, према постојећим дијалектолошким студијама, и негирани футур гради од глагола 'хтети'.

Истраживање показује да је стварање футура у јужнословенским језицима резултат садејства унутарјезичких и контактних процеса. Приликом рађања нових граматичких категорија, језици пролазе кроз период нестабилности, са више изворних конкурентних стратегија. У таквој ситуацији, језички контакти утичу на избор и промоцију једне од постојећих могућности.