

Auxiliary Clitics in Southwest Ukrainian: Questions of Chronology, Areal Distribution, and Grammaticalization*

Andrii Danylenko

Abstract: This paper addresses grammaticalization of the preterit and future auxiliary clitics derived from the verbs 'to be' and 'to take' in Southwest Ukrainian in comparison with North and Southeast Ukrainian, and the adjacent western and eastern Slavic dialects. It posits a parallel grammaticalization of such auxiliaries in the aspect of retrospection (preterit) and the aspect of prospection (future), although with different results in various Ukrainian dialects. Unlike the Polish auxiliaries that turned into person-number markers, the preterit auxiliary clitics are not fully degrammaticalized in Southwest Ukrainian and are altogether absent from North and Southeast Ukrainian. The auxiliary clitics used in the de-inceptive future derived from the periphrastic formation with the auxiliary 'to take' were undergoing grammaticalization along the clitic continuum postulated in the paper for the Ukrainian-speaking territories. The term 'synthetic future' in Modern Ukrainian for formations like *čytatymu* 'I will read' is misleading, since the grammaticalization of the auxiliary did not run to completion. This explains its loose integration with the infinitive and the de-inceptive interpretation of the synthetic future 'I will [begin] to read' as compared to the analytic future formation *ja budu čytaty* 'I will read' in all the major Ukrainian dialects.

1. Introduction

Clitics in East Slavic have largely remained beyond the scope of both synchronic and diachronic research after Jakobson 1935 and Gunnarsson 1935 (Zaliznjak 2008: 3). One reason for this, according to Franks and King (2000: 187), is the absence in the East Slavic literary languages of the kinds of pronominal and auxiliary clitics found in other

* I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers and Christina Bethin for their insightful suggestions for improvement. The research was partly supported by a scholarly grant from Dyson College at Pace University. I am also grateful to the discussants of this paper at the forty-first National Convention of the AAASS in Boston on 16 November 2009 as well as Henning Andersen and Björn Wiemer for bibliographical references. I alone am responsible for any shortcomings or errors.

Slavic languages. In fact, “special” clitics (Zwicky and Pullum 1983: 510) were lost in East Slavic, with the exception of Southwest Ukrainian, which unlike North and Southeast Ukrainian preserved pronominal clitics and “enclitic forms of the auxiliary verb in the past tense” as in SWU *spav=jèm* ‘slept=*PRET.AUX.1SG*’ next to *ja spav* ‘I slept’ (Shevelov 1993: 996).¹

Leaving aside both the frozen and inflected conditional auxiliary clitics like *=by_{COND.AUX}* and *=bych_{COND.AUX.1SG}* which warrant a separate study (Danylenko 2011a), I will concentrate instead on Ukrainian preterit and future auxiliary clitics of the type *=jem_{PRET.AUX.1SG}* and *=mu_{FUT.AUX.1SG}* as most representative in East Slavic. Both occur in the analytic tenses and demonstrate similarities in grammaticalization via complex interrelated changes in content as well as in syntax, including morphosyntactic and expression transformations (Andersen 2008: 15). Franks and King (2000: 197) argued that the preterit auxiliary seemed to behave much like the future auxiliary clitic in Southwest Ukrainian, a phenomenon that prompts me to treat the two types of auxiliary clitics in tandem. What is notable in this respect is the fact that the future clitics, used separately from the verb in Southwest Ukrainian, occur in North and Southeast (Modern) Ukrainian in the “inflected infinitives,” labeled “synthetic future” (SF) in historical and descriptive grammars of Ukrainian (Bevzenko et al. 1978: 328; Vyxovanec’ and Horodens’ka 2004: 254).

The reconstructable and observed changes in such auxiliary clitics will be examined in terms of grammaticalization, which may lead from

¹ The following abbreviations are used here: ACC (accusative), AF (analytic future), AOR (aorist), AUX (auxiliary), COND (conditional), Cz (Czech), ES (East Slavic), F (feminine), FUT (future), IMPERF (imperfective), INF (infinitive), LCS (Late Common Slavic), Lmk (Lemkian), M (masculine), MU (Middle Ukrainian), MoU (Modern Ukrainian), NU (North Ukrainian), ONo (Old Novgorodian), P (Polish), PERF (perfective), PF (periphrastic future), PL (plural), PRES (present tense), PRET (preterit), REFL (reflexive particle), RPP (resultative past participle), Ru (Rusyn), SG (singular), SEU (Southeast Ukrainian), SF (synthetic future), Slk (Slovak), SWU (Southwest Ukrainian), U (Ukrainian). To distinguish between auxiliary clitics and person-number markers, I use the equal sign “=” to refer to auxiliaries cited in isolation or primarily as “covert” clitics (written in some records together with their hosts). The hyphen “-” is reserved for person-and-number markers (suffixes) used either in isolation or within a word form. No special sign is employed for the orthotonic forms which are maintained for rhematic and emphatic use in contradistinction to phonologically reduced, atonic forms (Andersen 1987: 24).

lexical to grammatical and from grammatical to more grammatical forms (Heine and Kuteva 2006: 232). Called “grammation” and “re-grammation” by Andersen (2006: 38–39), these types of changes go hand in hand with another content change identified as “degrammation” by which an expression through reanalysis loses grammatical content (change from grammatical content to other, including zero, content) (ibid.). In North and Southeast Ukrainian the present perfect was “regrammatized,” for instance, as the general preterit, a change followed by the loss of the auxiliary (see section 3.4). Meanwhile, in Southwest Ukrainian this auxiliary tends to get “degrammatized” for tense, drifting from Wackernagel second position to become a preterit person-number ending. While this grammaticalization chain has not been completed in Southwest Ukrainian, where the auxiliaries routinely occur either as second-position or verb-adjacent clitics (Žylko 1955/1966: 100, 187), a similar process ran to completion in Modern Polish (Andersen 1987).

In view of a similar system of the preterit auxiliaries in the contiguous West Slavic languages (Slovak and especially Polish), I look at contact situations in order to understand the convergent developments in the historical period and some of the divergent developments in the recent prehistory of Ukrainian and neighboring languages (see sections 3.2–3.3). It should be emphasized that the system of convergences may appear rather convoluted. One example is literary Rusyn, which is based on the southwestern Ukrainian dialects transitional from Lemkian to Central Transcarpathian and spoken around Prešov (Ukr. Prjašiv) in East Slovakia (Jabur and Plišková 2007: 148). The ability of the person-marking auxiliary in this newly codified language to stand on its own would seem to tie this language more to Czech and Slovak than to Polish (Pugh 2011: 205):

- (1) a. SWU/Ru *bjv* (was_{M.SG}) *jem*_{PRET.AUX.1SG}, *bjlam* (was_{F.SG-1SG})
 b. Cz *sem*_{PRET.AUX.1SG} *byl* (was_{M.SG}), *byla* (was_{F.SG})
 c. Slk *som*_{PRET.AUX.1SG} *bol* (was_{M.SG}), *bola* (was_{F.SG})
 ‘I was’

On the other hand, the ability of the personal elements to occur directly with the base *l*-past tense form, originally a past resultative participle (PRP), does bring it more in line with Polish as well—although

not completely, because not all auxiliary clitics can be fused to the verb (Pugh 2011: 205–06):

(2) P <i>byłem</i> (was _{M.SG-1SG})	SWU/Ru <i>bǎv</i> (was _{M.SG}) <i>jem</i> _{PRET.AUX.1SG}
P <i>byłam</i> (was _{F.SG-1SG})	SWU/Ru <i>bǎlam</i> (was _{F.SG-1SG})
‘I was’	
P <i>byłeś</i> (was _{M.SG-2SG})	SWU/Ru <i>bǎv</i> (was _{SG.M}) <i>jes’</i> _{PRET.AUX.2SG}
P <i>byłaś</i> (was _{F.SG-2SG})	SWU/Ru <i>bǎlas’</i> (was _{F.SG-2SG})
‘You were’	

However, it is probably best to consider these phenomena as part of an areal development, rather than as elements of the Rusyn (Southwest Ukrainian) system that were borrowed from a particular language. For structural and historical-geographic reasons, it could tentatively be argued that Polish might have been crucial for the development of this feature in Lemkian neighboring with Polish, but it cannot have been for Rusyn (Pugh 2011: 206) and, in fact, for all the southwestern Ukrainian dialects, especially Bojkian, Central Transcarpathian, Hucul, Pokuttja, and Bukovyna (Matvijias et al. 1988, map 245) (see section 3.3).

In sum, the status of the auxiliaries in the analytic tenses in Southwest Ukrainian warrants revision in terms of grammaticalization and areal distribution (sections 3.2–3.4). Such revision encompasses the “new preterit” (past tense) derived from the “present perfect” with the auxiliary ‘to be’ not completely regrammaticalized in Southwest Ukrainian, as well as the synthetic future in *-mu*, which may float in this dialect, thus behaving like a clitic rather than a suffix as is commonly posited for this morpheme in literary Ukrainian (Franks and King 2002: 197).

2. Pragmatic Argumentation

One refinement that is necessary here, in my opinion, is the addition of a pragmatic dimension which is likely to explain close matching of the auxiliaries in the past and future tense systems, a phenomenon which Fleischman (1983: 197) postulated for Romance, Germanic, and Slavic. Following Fleischman (1983: 204, 192), I maintain that the grammaticalization of the two analytic tenses marks a progression from a psy-

chological rather than chronological notion of “current relevance” (*here and now*) to a temporal stage. At this stage the corresponding forms may be employed, pragmatically, in a similar fashion to describe future and past situations from the point of view of current relevance. In other words, the *here and now* is initially encoded, to use Fleischman’s terminology, as an “aspect of retrospection” for the present perfect tense with the “resultative meaning” tending to get regrammatized as preterit, and an “aspect of prospection” for the complex (compound) future tense with the auxiliary from the inceptive (phasal) perfective ‘to take’ not found in South and West Slavic (*ibid.*).² As was hypothesized elsewhere (Danylenko 2003: 389–414), however, a similar interplay of the prospective and retrospective aspects could be primarily characteristic of the typologically innovative (analytic) West European languages, which differ from East Slavic with the finite nominative-accusative structure closely following the flexional (synthetic) principle (Kurzová 1999: 503).

My thesis, that grammaticalization of the auxiliaries into person-number markers in both the “new preterit” and the synthetic future in Southwest Ukrainian is likely to have the same morphosyntactic progression (from word to clitic and, in tendency, to affix), links two important lines of argumentation about grammaticalization of the auxiliaries.

One line of argumentation is represented by Fleischman (1983: 187). She postulates a functional parallelism in the diachronic development of “present perfect” and “near future,” both of which evolved from complex (periphrastic) exponents of aspect whose pragmatic function was to identify the situation as being of “current relevance” to exponents of tense. Viewed through this pragmatic prism, the speaker himself appears to serve as a connecting link from a past event to a sit-

² The pragmatic interpretation of “prospective” vs. “retrospective” offered in this paper is by and large reminiscent of that in Andersen (2006: 11), according to whom the future in Late Common Slavic was, for instance, a prospective aspect and its opposite (which one could call the actual) was manifested in present, imperfect, and aorist. Yet our understanding of (aspects of) “prospection” (a future situation viewed as resulting from present circumstances) and “retrospection” (a past situation viewed in terms of its present repercussions) (Fleischman 1983: 191, 192) derives from the distinction of two opposite concept dominations in verbal encoding as represented by the analytic Western European and synthetic (East) Slavic languages (cf. Capell 1965; Danylenko 2000: 41–47, 64–65; 2003: 361–66).

uation evolving from the moment of utterance. Consequently, a non-present (either past or future) situation allows for a parallel development of the auxiliaries on either side of the *here and now*, that is, in the past and the future tense systems.

Andersen (2006: 33) expresses the other line of thought when he says that the simplest explanation of the diversity of the future auxiliaries with identical usage in the East Slavic dialects is to posit an internally motivated development, equally “natural” in all these dialects because they had similar conditions for such a development. In other words, the processes whereby various inceptive perfectives like *načati*, *počati*, *v”čati* ‘to begin’, *jati* ‘to take’ became grammaticalized, including the prospective aspect, were under way as far back as the Common Slavic period (Křížková 1960: 126–27). Since grammaticalization of the preterit and future auxiliaries parallels a progression from a psychological rather than chronological notion of “current relevance” (*here and now*) to a temporal stage, I maintain that the two kinds of auxiliaries underwent interrelated content changes such as grammation and degrammation, as well as similar morphosyntactic changes of the type word > =clitic and =clitic > -affix.

3. Grammaticalization (Degrammation) of Auxiliaries in the Retrospective Aspect

The set of *be*-auxiliaries and their distribution in Southwest Ukrainian are much more varied in comparison with the Rusyn variant(s) spoken in Subcarpathian Rus’, Prešov Rus’ (Hanudel’ 1994), and Lemkovyna (Fontans’kij 2004: 254; Kerča 2004: 137–39), all belonging to the Transcarpathian dialectal areal (Matvijas et al. 1988). I will begin with a brief overview of the attested forms in Rusyn(s) (section 3.1) and then propose a geographical survey of such auxiliaries, followed by a discussion of their structural characteristics resulting from a series of historical reanalyses in the retrospective aspect (section 3.2–3.3).³

³ A typological parallel with a similar grammaticalization scenario is the Irish Retrospective I, a periphrastic perfect used in all modern Irish dialects, of the type *tá sé tréis leitir a scríobh* ‘he is after writing a letter.’ As Greene (1979: 141) pointed out, it still retains sufficient subjective and emotional content to make it an aspectual category, which distinguishes it clearly from the purely temporal perfect in English. Leaving aside certain details, the Irish Retrospective I demonstrates a level of morphosyntactic integration of its auxiliary that can be compared with grammaticalization (degramma-

3.1. The Case of Codified Rusyn(s)

All codified varieties of Rusyn demonstrate almost similar auxiliary clitics ‘to be’ for the retrospective aspect, with minor morphophonemic differences:

(3)		1 sg	2 sg	1 pl	2 pl
	Subcarpathian	<i>jem</i>	<i>jes’</i>	<i>jes’me</i>	<i>jes’te</i>
	Prešov	<i>jem</i>	<i>es’</i>	<i>sme</i>	<i>ste</i>
	Lemkian	<i>jem</i>	<i>jes</i>	<i>sme</i>	<i>ste</i>

Interestingly, the preterit in Rusyn is coupled with the Eastern Slavic analytic future (AF) *budu* + *INF.IMPERF* (Latta 1991, map 283).⁴ In the codified variety of Lemkian, one happens on a peculiar mix of the AF developed from a combination of the auxiliary ‘to be’ with the RPP from imperfectives for singular and imperfective infinitives for plural (Fontans’kij 2004: 253):

- (4) a. Lmk *ja budu*_{FUT.AUX.1SG} *besiduval* (talked_{RPP.IMPERF.M.SG})
 ‘I will talk’
 b. Lmk *mȳ budeme*_{FUT.AUX.1PL} *besiduvaty* (talk_{INF.IMPERF})
 ‘we shall talk’

Historically, however, this AF could also derive from perfectives (Kernyc’kyj 1967: 230–31):

tion) of auxiliaries in the retrospective aspect in Southwest Ukrainian. I would like to thank Robert Orr for bringing this periphrastic construction to my attention, as well as providing the corresponding bibliographical reference.

⁴ There seem to be no solid grounds for maintaining the thesis about the contact-induced nature of this future tense, with the Czech area as a center of its radiation from the thirteenth century onward; the tense allegedly showed up subsequently in Polish, Belarusian, Ukrainian, and ultimately in the fifteenth century in Russian. There are obvious chronological and areal discrepancies in this hypothesis (Křížková 1960: 94, 99). Serious doubts about the borrowing of this future were recently expressed by Andersen (2006: 28), who assumed that this future had been long established in some Russian dialects in which just happened not to be attested. A similar explanation is likely to hold true for Ukrainian dialects where the corresponding future form were recorded relatively late.

- (5) MU *budeš'*_{FUT.AUX.2SG} *včynyl'*" (did_{RPP.M.SG})
 'you will do'

The latter fact casts serious doubt on this future's supposedly contact-induced status as evolving from the bilingual (Polish-Lemkian) context, since, unlike in Ukrainian and Belarusian, the parallel Polish construction employed *l*-participles from imperfectives only (Pan'kevyč 1938: 318).

3.2. The Dialect Evidence

In Southwest Ukrainian, *=jem*_{PRET.AUX.1SG} can be used as a Wackernagel or verb-adjacent clitic (Verxratskyj 1899: 91). In the Dniester, in western Volhynian, and some Central Transcarpathian dialects, forms like *xodyu*_{M.SG=PRET.AUX.1SG} *=jem* (walked_{M.SG=PRET.AUX.1SG}) or, sporadically in the Dnister dialect, *xodyl-ym* (walked_{M.SG-1SG}) 'I walked' occur in parallel use with preterits in *-u* (< *-l*) like (*ja*) *xodyu* next to *xodil* (walked_{M.SG}) 'I walked' attested in the Ukrainian dialects in East Slovakia (Matvijas et al. 1988, map 245; Pan'kevyč 1938: 313–14).

In the Middle Ukrainian period, this parallelism was already commonplace. Of particular interest are auxiliaries serving as allomorphs of the personal pronouns,⁵ cf. MU *em'*_{1SG} *nemocen'* (sick_{M.SG}) 'I am sick' (Petrov 1921: 5). This phenomenon seemed to have followed the general trend of the degrammation of auxiliaries into personal pronouns in some Slavic languages, in particular in Old Novgorodian, which regrammatized present perfect with the auxiliary 'to be' as the general preterit and lost the imperfect and aorist forms (Andersen 2008: 23). Allomorphs of personal pronouns like ONo *esmi* or MU *em'* 'I' were used as nominatives with present- as well as past-tense verbs, but later dropped out in favor of personal pronouns.

⁵ In addition to datives of the personal pronouns like *my* – *m"ně* '(to) me' and to accusatives of personal pronouns like *me* – *mene* 'me', Zaliznjak (2008: 240; cf. Xaburgaev 1978: 43–45) identified Old Rus(s)ian pairs of the type *esm'* '(I) am' – *jaz'* 'I' in the nominative as enclitic and orthotonic variants of functionally analogous units. A similar three-member prosodic system has been retained in Southwest Ukrainian (Žylko 1955/1966: 85–86), e.g., *meni/myni/mni/mne* – *my/mi* (Acc) 'I' (Matvijas et al. 1988, map 207). This seems to be one of the corollaries of weak stressing in the southwestern group of Slavic including, in addition to Bulgarian, Southwest Ukrainian, where auxiliaries are likely to function either as enclitic or proclitic (Jakobson 1935: 387)

In some Lemkian, Hucul, Bojkian, Central Transcarpathian, and western Podolian dialects, preterits with auxiliary clitics tend to occur today without any parallel forms. Already in 1902, Verxratskyj (1902: 140–41) pointed out that preterit auxiliaries are “[still] vividly conceived of as separate units” in Lemkian, as compared with a stronger bond of such auxiliaries with the *l*-stem in East Galicia, hence Lmk *xodyuua=jem* (walked_{F.SG=PRET.AUX.1SG}) next to *xodyla-m* (walked_{F.SG-1SG}) ‘I walked’ in the Dniester dialect. A similar level of decategorialization of the auxiliaries and their corresponding of their integration with the stem is traceable in some local feminine forms cited by Ogonowski (1880: 144): *xodyla=jam* (walked_{F.SG=PRET.AUX.1SG}) and *xodyla-m* (walked_{F.SG-PRET.1SG}) ‘I walked’. Expression reduction accompanying the process of degrammation is observed in auxiliaries for 2sg: =jes/=jes’, =jis/=jis’, =s/=s’ for masculine and =s/=s’ for feminine and neuter (Žylko 1955/1966: 100, 186). Such differences in univerbation are hard to ascertain with precision along all possible parameters (morphophonemic, prosodic, segmental), although forms of the types *xodyua=jam* (walked_{F.SG=PRET.AUX.1SG}) and *xodyla-m* (walked_{F.SG-PRET.1SG}) demonstrate arguably different degrees of bond strengthening, cf. =jam next to -m in the above examples.

The Hucul =sme_{PRET.AUX.1SG} (Matvijas et al., 1988, map 245) rendered =smy in Franks and King (2000: 197), thus appears homophonous with =smy_{PRET.AUX.1PL} deserves attention. Although attested from the sixteenth century on next to such variants as =sme, and =smo, e.g., *xodyu=smy/=sme/=smo* (walked_{M.SG=PRET.AUX.1SG}) ‘I walked’ (Ogonowski 1880: 148; Kernyc’kyj 1967: 202–204), the form =smy is not typologically representative and should be adjusted to the historical reflex =sme; the latter again homophonous with the Aux. 1 pl:

- (6) a. Hucul: *brau=sme* (took_{M.SG=PRET.AUX.1SG})
 ‘I took’
 braly^e=sme (took_{PL=PRET.AUX.1PL})
 ‘we took’
- b. Dniester: *brau=jem/=jim* (took_{M.SG=PRET.AUX.1SG})
 ‘I took’
 braly=smo (took_{PL=PRET.AUX.1PL})
 ‘we took’ (Kobyljans’kyj 1928: 61)

The following argument can be adduced in favor of the priority of *=sme*. In the bulk of the Ukrainian dialects, *i* and *y* coalesced between the late thirteenth century through the fifteenth century, triggering the merger of *jesmy* and *jesmĭ* as contextual variants of older *jesm* 'I am' in Middle Ukrainian and Belarusian. This distinction might have been maintained only in some southwestern Ukrainian dialects, partly because of their conservatism (in the case of Hucul) and partly because the distinction *i* – *y* (orthographically, *y* – *ĭ*) was never lost there (in the case of Lemkian) (Shevelov 1977: 252). This is why in Hucul *jesmy* survived in the form *=sme_{PRET.AUX.1SG}* (Žylko 1955/1966: 225). This is a normal reflex of *=smy_{PRET.AUX.1SG}*, because in Hucul *y* changed into *e* in the seventeenth century (Shevelov 1979: 666; Potebnja 1888/1958: 251). The existence of such a form in West Lemkian can be inferred, according to Shevelov (1977: 252), from its presence in the southwestern part of East Slovakian. Based on a Ukrainian substratum, these dialects use, unlike Slk *=som_{PRET.AUX.1SG}* (U *=jem*), such short forms as *=mi_{PRET.AUX.1SG}* and *=me_{PRET.AUX.1PL}* in competition with full forms of the type *=s'mi/=z'mi/=zme/=žme* for plural (Vážný 1934: 306; Stanislav 1958: 415; Bartko, Dzendzelivska, and Lipták 1998: 12):

- (7) a. Slk *volal* (called_{M.SG}) *mi_{PRET.AUX.1SG}*
 'I called'
- b. Slk *volal'i* (called_{PL}) *me/žme_{PRET.AUX.1PL}*
 'we called' (Štolc et al. 1981, map 275)

A similar distribution holds for the 1 pl auxiliary, e.g., (*my*) *xodyly* (walked_{PL}) next to *xodyly=smo* (walked_{PL=PRET.AUX.1PL}) 'we walked' as attested in Southwest Ukrainian and the Volhynian-Polissian dialects (Matvijias et al. 1988, map 245; Verxratskyj 1902: 141). Among its phonetic variants, one can cite *=smo/=s'mo/=z'mo*, *=smy/=s'my/=z'my*, and others (Žylko 1955/1966: 100; Matvijias et al. 2001, part 3: 218).

In sum, as compared with Polish, where the auxiliaries changed into person-number markers, the preterit auxiliary clitics are not (yet?) fully degrammatized in Southwest Ukrainian, thus demonstrating different levels of morphosyntactic integration. In Polish, the auxiliary 'to be' became an enclitic in the Middle Ages; later its forms were re-analyzed as mere person-number markers, gradually shifting to the position of the erstwhile main-verb participles which had long since

been regrammatized as finite forms. In Southwest Ukrainian, by contrast, these forms seem to remain clitic, occurring either in Wackernagel's position or after the main-verb participle. This dissimilarity allowed Żylko (1955/1966: 100) to argue that, unlike most of the Polish dialects, the development of the past tense had not yet been completed in Southwest Ukrainian.

Overall, such development in Southwest Ukrainian illustrates a case of the incomplete grammaticalization chain discussed by Andersen (2008: 18), although syntagmatic reduction of the auxiliaries was almost identical in Middle Polish (cf. Andersen 1987: 24) and Middle Ukrainian. The following synopsis represents Middle Ukrainian (Bevzenko et al. 1978: 325–36):

(8) MU	orthotonic	enclitic
1sg	<i>jesm' / jesmŷ</i>	<i>(e)m" / (o)m"</i>
2sg	<i>jesy</i>	<i>(e)s</i>
3sg	<i>jest</i>	\emptyset
1pl	<i>jesmy / jesm</i>	<i>(e)smŷ / (e)xmŷ / (e)xmo</i>
2pl	<i>jeste</i>	<i>(e)ste</i>
3pl	<i>sut'</i>	\emptyset

The question of whether the degrammation of the preterit auxiliaries in Southwest Ukrainian was contact-induced—either borrowed from or replicated (Heine and Kuteva 2006: 48–96) on West Slavic—remains open for discussion (section 3.3).

3.3. Polish Interference?

Arguably, very few undisputed structural interferences from Polish can be found in Ukrainian. One of them is *jestem'* 'I am' used in Middle Ukrainian under the influence of the Polish written standard (Kernyc'kyj 1967: 205). Among other contact-induced forms in Middle Ukrainian, one can cite the 1 sg marker *-om" / -om'* instead of *-em"* used predominantly in extant records from Volhynja and some northern Ukrainian dialects. Kernyc'kyj (ibid.) left unexplained forms like *podal-om"* (submitted_{M.SG-1SG}) 'I submitted' or *vydel-om"* (saw_{M.SG-1SG}) 'I saw'. According to Potebnja (1888/1958: 253–54), these spellings were influenced by the corresponding Polish person–number marker *-em*.

Ukrainian scribes would have erroneously seen the East Slavic *o* as a reflex of the back *jer*, like the *e* in Polish *-em*, and hypercorrected on that basis. Thus, forms in *-om* present a case of Polish-influenced restructuring.

3.3.1. Blends with the Element *x* (*ch*)

A much more convoluted development may be seen in the 1 pl auxiliary $=e)xmo$ ($< jexm\dot{y}$) still found in Southwest Ukrainian (Matvijas et al. 2001, part 3: 218). During the Middle Ukrainian period, this form was copiously attested in Subcarpathian homiliary gospels and sporadically in some Moldavian charters, e.g., *prinęly=xmĭy* (accepted_{PL=PRET.AUX.1PL}) ‘we accepted’, *jexmo_{PRET.AUX.1PL} lovyly* (caught_{PL}) ‘we caught’ (Kernyc’kyj 1967: 215). Following Potebnja (1888/1958: 253), most scholars (e.g., Bevzenko 1960: 298; Shevelov 1979: 80) treat this form as a Polish borrowing, although in principal the change of *s* into *x* in $=smy > =xmy_{PRET.AUX.1PL}$ (orthographically, *xmĭy*) is historically acceptable (Shevelov 1965: 127–31). Some believe that, even if influenced by Polish, $=xmy$ transformed phonetically into $=xmo$ in Ukrainian (Bevzenko et al. 1978: 326). In fact, a similar change is traceable in the 1 pl ending *-mo* which might have first appeared in athematic *jesmo* ‘we are’ and then spread to other athematic and thematic verbs at the turn of the fifteenth century (Shevelov 1977: 254). It is also tempting to posit for MU $=xmo$ an intrusion of the aorist form (Bevzenko 1960: 297–98; Kernyc’kyj 1967: 218). This explanation is traditionally postulated for parallel Polish forms, although Rospond (1971: 306) argued that the element *x* taken from the aorist form made its way not only to the conditional auxiliary but also to the 1 sg and pl ending in *jest-echmy* ‘we are’, *byli-chmy* ‘we were’, *był-ech* ‘I was’, and the like.

For Polish, the above hypothesis looks persuasive. Influenced by the conditional auxiliary $=byx_{COND.AUX.1SG}$ (orthographically, *bych*), the innovative change $-em > -ex_{1SG}}$ could have taken place as early as the fifteenth century in Małopolska and Śląsk. It was, according to Dejna (1973/1993: 229), a case of blending *e* from *jeśm* ‘I am’ and *x* from the conditional auxiliary $=byx$. Forms like *był-ech* ($was_{M.SG-1SG}}$) ‘I was’, which are still attested in some Silesian dialects, were commonplace in almost all the Polish-speaking areas in the fifteenth century and later. Through the mid-seventeenth century they were part of the literary standard cultivated by such writers as Mikołaj Rej, Stanisław

Orzechowski, and Marcin Bielski (Klemensiewicz 1974: 410).⁶ Today in Małopolska the element *x* in endings of the type *był-ech* is reflected as *k*. In the neighboring dialects of Spisz and Podhala *x* changed into *f* (Dejna 1973/1993: 229–30). All in all, the intrusion of *x* from the conditional auxiliary *bych* into the person-number markers of the type *-em* in Polish looks plausible (Urbańczyk 1953: 42), especially if one takes into consideration that the demise of the conditional auxiliary clitics like *=byx* was closely followed by the fall of the preterit in *-x* (orthographically, *-ch*), in particular in northern borderland Polish in the mid-seventeenth century (Kurzowa 1988: 209).

A similar expression change took place in some western (e.g., Myjava) and northern Central Slovak dialects (e.g., Liptov, Orava), as well as in many other Slovak dialects (Stanislav 1958: 400). Suffice it to cite here such mixed (aorist blended with preterit < present perfect) forms as *nesl-ch* and *nesol-ch* (carried_{M.SG-1SG}) ‘I carried’, *zašētech* (stopped.by_{M.SG-1SG}) ‘I stopped by’ which, according to Vondrák (1908: 176), could have been influenced by aorists like *nesech* (carried_{AOR-1SG}) ‘I carried’. Gebauer (1898: 425) believed, however, that the conditional auxiliary *bych* was more likely to serve as the major source of blending with the RPP in *-l*, with the element *x* spreading to new preterits like *nesl-ch* (carried_{1SG}), hence *-(e)chme*, *-(e)chmy*_{1PL}. Preterits with *-(e)ch* were commonly attested across the Slovak-speaking territories. As late as the early twentieth century in the dialect of Myjava (northern group of West Slovak) the following forms with the element *x* occurred either in the clause second or verb-adjacent position: *já-ch* (I_{1SG}) *robel* (worked_{M.SG}) ‘I worked’, *ból-ch* (was_{M.SG-1SG}), and *bola-ch* (was_{F.SG-1SG}) ‘I was’ competing with an analytic formation *bol* (was_{M.SG}) *som*_{PRET.AUX.1SG} ‘I was’. In general, from the early twentieth century preterits with the element *x* tended to disappear under pressure of more regular analytic formations (Vážný 1926: 334).

In light of the wide areal distribution of the blended formations with the element *x*, one can agree that the corresponding Slovak

⁶ Rospond (1971: 306) argued that the preterit in *-ex* emerged in all the Polish-speaking territories in the late fifteenth to early sixteenth century and was therefore employed by all Poles. Subsequently, these forms might have disappeared in the literary language in the early seventeenth century, although remaining in some dialects, in particular in the southwestern part of Poland. This theory, supported by Kurzowa (1988, 1993: 198), has no bearing on the scenario of degrammaticalization for the preterit with the element *x* which was borrowed from the conditional *=byx*.

formations could hardly have been influenced by Polish (Vážný 1926: 336–37; Stanislav 1958: 400). They were likely to have shared a Polish tendency to have a similar element in new preterits in the early modern literary standard. It is not surprising that the Polish Goral dialect in Slovakia innovated on *k* instead of *x*, hence *mog* (could_{M.SG}) *jek*_{PRET.AUX.1SG} (*mohl jsem*) ‘I could’, while the neighboring Slovak dialects would keep the said aorist element in forms like *mug* (could_{M.SG}) *jech*_{PRET.AUX.1SG} ‘I could’ (Vážný 1926: 337).

Ukrainian is characterized today by a limited areal diffusion of the auxiliaries with the element *x* across its southwestern dialects, so it is difficult to devise a plausible creation story for the 1 pl auxiliary *=(je)xmo* liberally attested in the Middle Ukrainian period. There are, however, a few peculiar Transcarpathian preterits, *vjux* ‘I lead’ (cf. *vedu*_{PRES.1SG}), *mjux* ‘I swept’ (cf. *metu*_{PRES.1SG}), *pljux* ‘I plaited’ (cf. *pletu*_{PRES.1SG}), *bux* ‘I pricked’ (cf. *bodu*_{PRES.1SG}), and their derivatives (Pan’kevyc̣ 1928: 2, 1938: 316; Bevzenko 1960: 298) which may prove diagnostic as to the origin of the preterits with the element *x*. Two of the aforementioned verbs are first attested in the sixteenth century Transcarpathian *Njagove postilla*, extant in the 1758 copy (Petrov 1921: 31). Today such forms are in use between the middle Uh and the Turja rivers in the west, and the Teresva and even the Ruskova rivers in the east, though not in Hucul (Shevelov 1979: 80). There are several hypotheses about these forms (Jagić 1916: 500; Gerovskij 1929; Kuraszkievycz 1939: 99; Bevzenko 1960: 298). Shevelov (1979: 80), for instance, supposed that the Transcarpathian forms might have had the word-final sequence *u + v*, i.e., [uṽ], contracted into *u*; subsequently, the latter *u* was “covered” by *x*, possibly taken from the 1 sg aorist, provided, as the author stressed, that the latter still existed at a point after the change *-v [u] < l* in these verbal forms (not earlier than the fifteenth century).⁷

⁷ This explanation looks conjectural in view of a limited number of such verbs. Additionally, the word-final *x* in these verbs can be a mere voiceless reflex of the *h* (Kuraszkievycz 1939: 99), a change that might have taken place in compliance with the principle of phonemic voicing in Southwest Ukrainian (Danylenko 2006: 191–92). The introduction of the element *x* into Shevelov’s theory is not very different from the conventional interpretation of the analogous forms in Slovak, cf. SWU *pryvjuj-x* > *pryvjuh/pryvjujux* ‘I brought [somebody] here’ (Pan’kevyc̣ 1928: 4). Shevelov’s theory seems to accord with Pan’kevyc̣’s (1938: 371) doubts about what devices (phonetic or mor-

It is therefore reasonable to assume that the development of the southwestern Ukrainian auxiliaries acquiring the element *x* was internally—both phonetically and morphologically—motivated rather than replicated on the model of one of the contiguous languages. The multiple concatenation of auxiliaries, such as that found in the following example from Hucul, possibly indicates indigenous development (Kobyljans’kyj 1928: 59):

- (9) SWU *dəvew=jex=sme=sy*
 looked_{M.SG=PRET.AUX.1SG=PRET.AUX.1SG=REFL}
 ‘I looked’

At first glance, the enclitics *=sme* and especially *=jex* added immediately to the RPP *dəvew*, can be treated as affixes with the reflexive particle *=sy*, a clitic in Southwest Ukrainian, attached in word-final position. However, multiple concatenation (agglutination) of auxiliaries, with no morpheme-boundary *sandhi* (morphophonemic change), is likely to involve cliticization rather than suffixation in this case. The same construction is attested some 50 years earlier in the same dialectal areal (Ogonowski 1880: 145):

- (10) SWU *dyvyv=jex sy sme*
 looked_{M.SG=PRET.AUX.1SG=REFL=PRET.AUX.1SG}
 ‘I looked’

The placement of *=sme* corresponds with the relative ordering of the eight East Slavic enclitics grouped within a cluster (Zaliznjak 2008: 28). For *jex*, however, it is not clear whether this form is still an auxiliary clitic *=jex* or already a person-and-number affix *-jex*. Franks and King (2000, 198) are inclined to treat forms immediately followed by *sy* as auxiliary clitics:

- (11) SWU *prošumala=jes=sy*
 woke.up_{F.SG=PRET.AUX.2SG=REFL}
 ‘you woke up’

phological) could have triggered the appearance of such preterits, thus leaving the question of their provenance open.

3.4. The Chronology and Areal Distribution

The preterit auxiliaries are attested in literary texts from Southwest and North Ukrainian from the sixteenth century onward, although the (prehistoric) chronology of their grammaticalization in local dialects is hard to ascertain. Both in vernacular and literary language, they could occur either in Wackernagel or verb-adjacent position, thus having much in common with the degrammation of Middle Polish auxiliaries. However, unlike the Polish person-number markers, the Ukrainian auxiliary clitics show a limited segmental and prosodic univerbation with terminal verb forms.

What is noteworthy is that preterits with auxiliary clitics are almost absent in Southeast Ukrainian, which was shaped in the seventeenth century by speakers of Southwest and North Ukrainian (Kernyc'kyj 1967: 218–19; Shevelov 1979: 764). Yet the auxiliary clitics made their way into the administrative language used in Russian-ruled Ukraine, and they occur sporadically in the local texts as late as the end of the eighteenth to early nineteenth century. (Marčylo 2006a: 150). Since Modern Ukrainian was largely based on Southeast Ukrainian, auxiliary clitics remained isolated in the conservative southwestern Ukrainian dialects, which were partly integrated into newly formed literary Ukrainian only in the late nineteenth to early twentieth century.

4. Grammaticalization (Grammation) of Auxiliaries in the Prospective Aspect

Auxiliaries in the retrospective aspect might, as was hypothesized in sections 1 and 2, have been grammaticalized in tandem with those in the prospective aspect. On closer inspection, however, some differences become obvious.

As mentioned above (see fn. 2), “prospection” involves the complex future tense with the auxiliary derived from the inceptive perfective ‘to take’. The de-inceptive future tense is found in Ukrainian and some Belarusian and Russian dialects (Sobolevskij 1888/1907: 238, Avanesaŭ, Krapiva, and Mackevič 1963, map 166), although it is not attested either in South or West Slavic (Andersen 2008: 30–31). I assume that in Southwest Ukrainian the tense forms projected toward “prospection” and “retrospection” demonstrate a parallel reanalysis of

their auxiliaries. Therefore the degrammation of “present perfect” with the auxiliary ‘to be’ into preterit and the grammation of the de-inceptive paraphrase with the auxiliary ‘to take’ into future should be seen as primarily internal developments.

4.1. The (Late) Common Slavic Background

Called today synthetic future in Modern Ukrainian, the de-inceptive future tense of the type *čytaty-mu* (to read_{INF-FUT.1SG}) ‘I will read’ is sometimes derived from a periphrastic construction with the auxiliary *imati* ‘to have’ (Dahl 2000: 319; Franks and King 2000: 197), which is in fact the imperfective LCS **jīmati – jemljq* ‘to take’.⁸ In reality, however, the SF originated from a paraphrase with the inceptive perfective LCS **jēti – jīmō* ‘to take’, as an auxiliary different from the de-modal extension of **jīmēti – jīmami* ‘to have (to)’ (Křížková 1960: 111–12; Večerka 1993: 174–80).⁹ Paraphrases with ‘to take’ occurred in East Slavic, including early Middle Russian, in parallel use with other inceptive prefixed verbs with *-čati* ‘to begin’, although in Modern Russian the AF of the type *budu* + *INF.IMPERF* ultimately prevailed. In Ukrainian, as well as

⁸ Dealing with the cognitive and semantic motivation of the formation of the Ukrainian SF, Levin-Steinmann (2010: 47–85) claimed that the distinction between the auxiliaries ‘to take’ and ‘to have’ is purely artificial since it is based on formal features rather than on the reconstruction of cognitive and semantic devices behind the inception of the form in question. According to this author (*ibid.*, 69), the Ukrainian SF might have been modeled on the cognitive conceptualization of the verb ‘to have’ as found in Greek; Ukrainian, allegedly, only elaborated on the Greek cognitive pattern by having it grammaticalized on the semantic and formal (phonetic) levels. This theory, however, is not convincing since Levin-Steinmann ignores both dialectal and historical evidence from Ukrainian.

⁹ For a pertinent discussion of three Common Slavic verbs with the root **em-*, a determined imperfective LCS **jēti – jīmō* ‘to take’, an indetermined imperfective LCS **jīmati – jemljq* ‘to take’, and imperfective LCS **jīmēti – jīmami* ‘to have (to)’ (Meillet 1924: 203), which came historically to be confused in East Slavic, see Danylenko 2002: 111–13 and 2003: 401–04. The main reason behind the confusion of U ‘to have’ and ‘to take’ is likely to have been the morphophonological overlapping of the corresponding verbs *imēti* ‘to have’ and *jati* ‘to take’ as exemplified in the Middle Ukrainian homonymic *imut’* from both *imēti* (< **jīmēti*) and *jati* (< **jēti*). The two tended to coalesce semantically (Kernyc’kyj 1967: 233), which could have brought about their convergent grammaticalization. Positing the “verb *imēti* or *jati* (‘to have’ or ‘to get’)” as the source of the “suffix” in the SF in Fici 2009: 205 is therefore confusing and has nothing to do with the actual overlapping of the two verbs in Middle Ukrainian.

in Belarusian, de-inceptive paraphrases with the auxiliary *jati* (< **jēti*) ‘to take’ have been used, from the fourteenth century onward, concurrently with the AF composed of the auxiliary ‘to be’ and an infinitive or a RPP (the *l*-form) (Bevzenko et al. 1978: 328–29; Bulyka, Kramko, and Žuraški 1979: 256–58). This prompted the idea of a stylistic parallelism between the SF and the future *budu* + *INF.IMPERF* in Modern Ukrainian (Vyxovanec’ and Horodens’ka 2004: 254; Andersen 2006: 30). However, typologically and areally, this hypothesis calls for revision.

4.2. The Emergence of *l*-less Forms of LCS *jēti*

The de-inceptive future auxiliaries were clause-second until the fifteenth and sixteenth century. One of the first attestations of their concatenation with the verb in West Ukrainian dates to the mid-sixteenth century:

- (12) MU *ne nadevaty-met’*
 not hope_{INF-FUT.3SG}
 ‘He/she will not hope’ (Ohijenko 1930: 386)

A similar spelling, allegedly reflecting a drift from clause second to verb-adjacent position, reached Southeast Ukrainian in the mid-seventeenth century (Bevzenko 1997: 215). Historical evidence indicates that the SF was a new formation spreading from Southwest Ukrainian via the western and northern dialects to Southeast Ukrainian.

What is important is the emergence of *i*-less forms of the verb *jēti* ‘to take’ as early as the thirteenth century, that is, before the grammation of the latter verb in periphrastic constructions (Shevelov 1979: 271). In other words, the reduction *ǰimǰ* > *imǰ/imu* > *-mu* could have occurred before this verb underwent grammation and the content-syntactic upgrading of its lexical feature ‘Inceptive’ as aspectual ‘Prospective’ in the de-inceptive PF (Bevzenko et al. 1978: 329):

- (13) 1 sg (*i*)*mu* > *mu* pl (*i*)*mem''* > *memo/meme*
 2 sg (*i*)*meši* > *meš* pl (*i*)*mete* > *mete*
 3 sg (*i*)*met''* > *me* pl (*i*)*mut''* > *mut’*

This paradigm of the auxiliary *maty* ‘to take’ was already attested in the sixteenth century and opposed semantically to a new form *maty – maju* from ES *iměti : mam* ‘to have (to)’ (< LCS **jǐměti – jǐmamĩ*) used with imperfectives in the de-modal paraphrases which were indigenous in Middle Ukrainian and Middle Belarusian. One argument in favor is the emergence of the *i*-less *meti : mam* in Middle Ukrainian (and Middle Belarusian) independently from West Slavic, an assertion which is tentatively supported by relative chronology and written attestations, shaky as they may appear at first glance (Shevelov 1979: 33–34). The Polish *i*-less form *mieć : mam* was sporadically attested from 1387 onward, that is, as Shevelov (1979: 271) emphasized, a whole century later than in Ukrainian. True, the Polish form might have arisen in some Polish dialects much earlier. Yet in Poland the center of irradiation of the *mieć*-type forms was Wielkopolska, while in East Poland, which is close to Ukraine, the *i*-forms were not abandoned until the sixteenth century (Danylenko 2002: 112). The latest studies by Marčylo (2006a: 156, 2006b: 80–83; also Mykhaylyk 2010: 367) corroborate the assumption that expression reduction encompassed the verbs *jěti* ‘to take’ and *iměti* ‘to have’ before they were reanalyzed as auxiliary clitics in both de-inceptive and de-modal paraphrases in East Slavic.

4.3. Areal Distribution of the Future Tense Formation

The historical progression of the de-inceptive constructions from the southwest to the southeast is tentatively traceable in their modern areal distribution. In Southwest Ukrainian the future tense with the *i*-less auxiliary clitic, used in clause second or verb-adjacent position, occurs predominantly alongside the AF derived with the help of the auxiliary ‘to be’ and the infinitive. In Lemkian, the construction *budu + INF.IMPERF* is found in parallel use with the AF developed from a combination of the auxiliary ‘to be’ with a RPP (Matvijias et al. 1988, map 244; see also section 3.1 above). Yet, in some Central Transcarpathian (e.g., Xust), Hucul, Pokuttja, and Bukovyna dialects the future tense, comprised of the future auxiliary clitic =*mu* in Wackernagel position, is the only possible future formation (Kobyljans’kyj 1928: 61–62; Bevzenko 1997: 213). In Rusyn (including the lately codified Subcarpathian variant in Slovakia) this form is not attested.

The future tense system in Southwest Ukrainian can be summarized in the following way with A_1 and A_2 functioning as contextual variants:

(14) SWU

A_1 . *budu*_{FUT.AUX.1SG} *braty* (*take*_{INF.IMPERF})

A_2 . *budu*_{FUT.AUX.1SG} *braj* (*taken*_{RPP.M.SG})

B. *mu*_{FUT.AUX.1SG} *braty* (*take*_{INF.IMPERF}) ~
braty (*take*_{INF.IMPERF}) *mu*_{FUT.AUX.1SG}

'I shall take'

In Polissja, with the exception of some northern Volhynian dialects, the de-inceptive PF regularly turns into the synthetic formation with the auxiliary clitic concatenated with the infinitive (Matvijan et al., 1984, map 263). The recording of such forms in North Ukrainian and neighboring South Belarusian might have been influenced by modern orthographic rules which require their spelling as one word.

Finally, in Southeast Ukrainian, the de-inceptive PF with the auxiliary clitic agglutinated with the infinitive is copiously attested in parallel use with the more common AF *budu* + *INF.IMPERF* (Matvijan et al. 2001, part 4: 218). The de-inceptive PF was ushered in comparatively late there, in the seventeenth century (Marčylo 2006b: 80–81), with the influx of colonizers arriving from the southwestern and northern Ukrainian lands. As in North Ukrainian, the de-inceptive construction competed with another East Slavic model *budu* + *INF.IMPERF*, supported by the parallel formation in the neighboring Russian language area.

The future tense system in North and Southeast (Modern) Ukrainian can be summed up in the following way:

(15) NU/SEU

A. *budu*_{FUT.AUX.1SG} *braty* (*take*_{INF.IMPERF})

B. *braty-mu* (*take*_{INF-FUT.1SG})

'I shall take'

All in all, Southwest Ukrainian seems to have a more varied future-tense system, although all the major Ukrainian dialects employ the Type A future (where A_1 and A_2 function as contextual variants) with

the auxiliary 'to be' and the Type B future is derived with the help of the auxiliary 'to take'.

For the Type A future, the verb 'to be' has not changed beyond grammation and the content-syntactic upgrading of its lexical feature as aspectual 'Prospective', either in Southwest or North/Southeast Ukrainian. For the Type B future, the verb 'to take' has undergone grammation and contact-syntactic upgrading of its lexical feature 'Inceptive' as aspectual 'Prospective' (Andersen 2006: 29, 30), although these changes were not followed by complete morphosyntactic integration, neither in Southwest Ukrainian nor in North/Southeast Ukrainian (section 4.4).

4.4. An Alternative Treatment of the SF

The areal distribution of the future tense formations as attested in the *Atlas of the Ukrainian language* (Matvijas et al., 1984–2001) can be projected onto the clitic continuum proposed in Danylenko 2010. This will allow us to ascertain the degree of grammaticalization of the de-inceptive auxiliary 'to take' in Ukrainian. It was suggested there that such a continuum subsequently underwent a reranking of inceptiveness in Southwest Ukrainian where the auxiliary clitic is still used autonomously in sentence structure, predominantly in clause-second position, via North Ukrainian to Southeast Ukrainian where the auxiliary is already concatenated with the infinitive, although without any word-internal morphophonemic change. Viewed from the historical perspective, such reranking might appear somewhat fuzzy both areally and structurally. What is clear, however, is that across the entire Ukrainian-speaking territories future does not *completely* correspond to that of suffixation.

The continuum of inceptiveness allows for semantic differentiation between the Ukrainian SF with the auxiliary 'to take' and the AF with the auxiliary 'to be' which have largely been considered stylistic variants (Bilodid 1969: 373–74; Dahl 2000: 319; Andersen 2006: 30). But there is an alternative interpretation, outlined in the late nineteenth century by Potebnja (1888/1958: 358) and accepted by Ukrainian linguists in the 1920s–30s, although purged by the Soviet normalizers

during the 1933–41 period.¹⁰ Recently, this theory was revived by Bevzenko (1997: 216–17), according to whom the AF with the auxiliary ‘to be’ denotes “a future event, [conceived] in general,” without any nuance of inceptiveness, thus presenting an upcoming event as “prolonged and gradual;” the future tense with the auxiliary ‘to take’, instead, focuses on the inceptiveness (inchoateness) of a particular event (Marčylo 1997: 23–24, 2001: 78–79; Danylenko 2010: 118, 2011b: 168–71).

The inceptive semantics of the auxiliary ‘to take’ has been largely retained in the archaic southwestern Ukrainian dialects. North Ukrainian seems to hold an intermediate position, especially in its northern-based transitional dialects, which introduced the de-inceptive future with the auxiliary clitic in verb-adjacent position (Hancov 1924: 132). In the newest southeastern dialects, however, the two future-tense formations, although tending to occur in parallel use (Vaščenko 1957: 239), show semantic differences of the type discussed by Bevzenko and his followers.

(16) SEU (*Sloboda* dial.)

vona j ne lajatymetcja [sic] j ni slova ne skaže
 she even not curse_{INF-FUT.3SG-REFL} and no word not sa_{FUT.3SG}
 ‘She won’t begin to scold and won’t utter a word’¹¹

It is not, therefore, surprising to find conflicting interpretations of the SF in modern (post-Soviet) grammars and reference books. Some authors treat its infinitive as a bound stem hosting the clitic *mu* and the

¹⁰ Along with overt efforts to Russify speakers of Ukrainian during this period came interference into the structure of the Ukrainian language. Soviet linguistic policy was aimed not only at legitimizing Russianisms but also at restoring morphosyntactic elements shared with Russian (Shevelov 1989: 156, 171). It is not generally known among Western linguists that such Ukrainian scholars as Smerečyns’kyj (1932: 127), Kurylo (1920/1960: 38), and Synjavs’kyj (1931/1967: 79) were purged in the 1930s together with their theories, including the different meanings of the SF and AF in Ukrainian. One should also note that the Soviet normalizers routinely screened literary texts for dialectal elements not shared by Russian. This may be why Vyxovanec’ and Horodens’ka (2004: 254) did not cite any examples of the future with the auxiliary ‘to take’ from Western Ukrainian authors.

¹¹ Numerous examples excerpted from different Ukrainian dialects are cited in Smerečyns’kyj 1932: 126–28; for other examples see Danylenko 2010: 118.

like, with the derivational formant *-m-* (Bilodid 1969: 374; Vyxovanec' and Horodens'ka 2004: 254). Most tellingly, this interpretation fails to account for the lack of possible morphophonemic fusion (expression reduction) at the morpheme boundary like, for instance, a syncope of the final *-(t)y* followed by a regrammation of the infinitive stem as the present tense stem: *berehty*_{INF}-*mu*_{FUT.1SG} > **berek-mu* > **berež-mu* 'I will keep'.¹² The lack of any change, at least in its inception, is remarkable for this position, especially in those southeastern dialects where the infinitive routinely ends in *-t'* as in *čydat'* 'to read' (Žylko 1955/1966: 246), cf. *čydaty*_{INF}-*mu*_{FUT.1SG} > **čydat'-mu* > **čytač-mu* 'I will read'. Morphophonemic fusion, and particularly in the eastern Slavic velar infinitive (Flier 1978), is typologically characteristic of the prototypical East Slavic word form (Danylenko 2003: 403).

The major *ex adverso* arguments for "residual cliticization" of the de-inceptive auxiliary 'to take' rather than its "complete suffixation" can be summarized as follows:

1. Irrespective of its position, the verb 'to take' functions as an auxiliary clitic across the clitic continuum postulated for all Ukrainian-speaking territories. The use of the reflexive postfix *-sja/-s'* after the agglutinated auxiliary as found, for instance, in SEU/MoU *smijaty-mu-s'* (laugh_{INF-FUT.1SG-REFL}) 'I will laugh', appears to be the only diagnostic feature of the alleged univerbation (cf. Mykhaylyk 2010: 373). Its prognostic capacity, however, looks insufficient for defining the future auxiliary as an affix since clitic ordering varies across the Ukrainian dialects (Ogonowski 1880: 147).

Based on the clitic continuum proposed for the entire Ukrainian-speaking territories, there are grounds for a truly de-inceptive interpretation of the future tense with the auxiliary 'to take' not only in Southwest but also in Southeast (Modern) and North Ukrainian; hence the semantic and stylistic differences between forms like *pysatymu* (write_{(=)FUT.(AUX).1SG}) 'I shall [begin to]

¹² Having historically undergone a process of univerbation, the Serbian future I seems to demonstrate a parallel change: *hoć-u*_{PRES.1SG} *pisati* (write_{INF}) 'I want to write' > *pisati=hoć-u*_{FUT.1SG} > *писаć-u*_{FUT.1SG}, that is, word > inflected clitic > suffix (Andersen 2008: 27). It should be recalled that, depending on the syntactic and stylistic environment, the auxiliary of Serbian future I can be used, as in Ukrainian, in clause second position, with no erosion in the infinitive (Piper 2009: 401).

write' (see example (18)) and the AF of the type *budu*_{AUX.FUT.1SG} *pysaty* (write_{INF}) 'I shall write' (Bevzenko 1997; Marčylo 1997, 2001, 2006a, 2006b, 2007; Danylenko 2010).

2. There is no segmental univerbation of the auxiliary concatenated with the infinitive in southeastern and some northern dialects: no expression reduction (erosion) is observed at the morpheme boundary between the infinitive and the auxiliary clitic in verb-adjacent position. Even if the auxiliary is concatenated with the infinitive it does not appear, as Žylko (1955/1966: 187) argued, either semantically or morphosyntactically fully integrated with the host. The fact that such auxiliaries are always written together with the infinitive in Modern Ukrainian does not necessarily mean, according to Simovyč (1918/1919: 279), that they "are internally fused;" they are semantically "autonomous words" rather than "suffixes or endings" (sic).

5. Conclusion

The foregoing analysis has shown that grammaticalization of the tense forms in retrospective and prospective aspects was by and large uniform in Southwest Ukrainian. The so-called new preterit derived from the present perfect and the PF that evolved from the de-inceptive paraphrases have many features in common. First, degrammation of the former and the grammation of the latter tense form probably began simultaneously in the Middle Ukrainian period. Second, with respect to Southeast and North Ukrainian, the name of the SF is misleading since the grammation of its auxiliaries did not run to completion, hence their loose integration with the infinitive as evidenced in particular in the de-inceptive interpretation of the PF in the Southwest Ukrainian (17) and SF in Southeast and North Ukrainian (18a) and in Modern Ukrainian (18b):

(17) SWU *mu*_{=FUT.AUX.1SG} *pysaty*_{INF}

(18) a. SEU/NU *pysaty*_{INF} *mu*_{=FUT.AUX.1SG}

b. MoU *pysaty-mu*_{(=)FUT.(AUX).1SG}

'I will [begin to] write'

Finally, there are no solid grounds for regarding the preterit and future tense formations as contact-induced (replica-like) innovations in Ukrainian. Developing in tandem, the new preterit and PF/SF are internally motivated, although they could have been strengthened by some adjacent Polish and Slovak dialects, especially in the case of the new preterit. This may be the reason behind the absence of one of the two formations in certain dialects, for instance, in the Central Transcarpathian dialect of Ublja, where the SF has not been used alongside the preterit with the auxiliary clitic ‘to be’ (Broch 1895).

The last few examples discussed (sections 4–4.4) illustrate that grammaticalization should be viewed as a dynamic process where some changes may be, more often than not, incomplete. One such example is found in the realm of grammation of the PF as observed in Southeast (Modern) and North Ukrainian. Furthermore, linguists must rely both on historical (reconstructable as well as textual) and dialectal attestations in order to identify individual changes involved in grammaticalization. Precise classifications and “symmetrical” definitions, especially those based on fragmentary material bequeathed from the Soviet era, might be sometimes misleading. They cannot explain, for example, why Southeast (Modern) and North Ukrainian introduced the new [synthetic] future but not the new preterit with the auxiliary clitic occurring either in Wackernagel or verb-adjacent position, thus differing from Russian, where the preterit auxiliary clitics together with the de-inceptive paraphrases were dropped several centuries ago. But that may be a topic for future research, which we expect will provide additional support for the theory of Ukrainian auxiliary clitics offered here.

References

- Andersen, Henning. (1987) “From auxiliary to desinence”. Martin Harris and Paolo Ramat, eds. *Historical development of auxiliaries*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 21–51.
- . (2006) “Periphrastic futures in Slavic: Divergence and convergence”. Kerstin Eksell and Thora Vinther, eds. *Change in verbal systems: Issues in explanation*. Bern: Peter Lang, 9–45.

- Andersen, Henning. (2008) "Grammaticalization in a speaker-oriented theory of change". Thórhallur Eythórsson, ed. *Grammatical change and linguistic theory: The Rosendal papers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 11–44.
- Avanesaŭ, R. I., A. A. Krapiva, and Ju. F. Mackevič, eds. (1963) *Dyjalektalahičny atlas belaruskaj movy*. Minsk: Akademija navuk Belaruskaj SSR.
- Bartko, Ladislav, Natalija Dzendzelivska, and Štefan Lipták. (1998) "K charakteristike slovenských nářečí na Zakarpatskej Ukrajině". *Slavia Slovaca* 33(1): 3–17.
- Bevzenko, S. P. (1960) *Istoryčna morfolohija ukrajins'koji movy*. Užhorod: Zakarpats'ke oblasne vydavnyctvo.
- . (1997) "Formy vyjavu majbutn'oji diji v ukrajins'kyx dialektax". P. Ju. Hrycenko et al., eds. *Ukrajins'kyj dialektolohičnyj zbirnyk*, vol. 3. Kiev: Dovira, 213–17.
- Bevzenko, S. P., Hryščenko, T. B. Lukinova, V. V. Nimčuk, V. M. Rusanivs'kyj, and S. P. Samijlenko. (1978) *Istorija ukrajins'koji movy: Morfolohija*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
- Bilodid, I. K., ed. (1969) *Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova: Morfolohija*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
- Broch, Olaf. (1895) "Zum Kleinrussischen in Ungarn". *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 17: 321–416.
- Bulyka, A. M., I. I. Kramko, and A. I. Žuraŭski. (1979) *Historyčnaja marfolohija belaruskaj movy*. Minsk: Navuka i tehnika.
- Capell, Arthur. (1965) "A typology of concept domination". *Lingua* 15(5): 451–62.
- Dahl, Östen. (2000) "The grammar of future time reference in European languages". Östen Dahl, ed. *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 309–28.
- Danylenko, Andrii. (2000 [1997]) "The Genitive of agent and the Instrumental of means in Old Ukrainian: An old idea worth revisiting?". *General linguistics* 37(1): 41–70.
- . (2002) "The East Slavic 'have': Revising a developmental scenario". Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin E. Huld, Angela Della Volpe, and Miriam Robbins Dexter, eds. *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, November 9–10, 2001*. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 105–27.
- . (2003) *Predykaty, vidminky i diatezy v ukrajins'kij movi: Istoryčnyj i typolohičnyj aspekty*. Xarkiv: Oho.

- Danylenko, Andrii. (2006) *Slavica et Islamica: Ukrainian in Context*. Munich: Otto Sagner.
- . (2010) “Naskil’ky ukrajinskyj syntetyčnyj majbutnij čas je syntetyčnym?” *Movoznavstvo* 4–5: 113–21.
- . (2011a) “Lota vŷvjuv”, a pjat’ varŷšuv’ pohubyl’: A case of auxiliary clitics in Southwest Ukrainian”. Andrii Danylenko and Serhii Vakulenko, eds. *Studien zu Sprache, Literatur und Kultur bei den Slaven. Gedenkschrift für George Y. Shevelov zum 100. Geburtstag*. Munich: Otto Sagner, 79–94. [*Der Welt der Slaven: Sammelbände*, 42.]
- . (2011b) “Is there any inflectional future in East Slavic? A case of Ukrainian against Romance reopened”. Motoki Nomachi, ed. *Grammaticalization in Slavic Languages*. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University, 147–77.
- Dejna, Karol. (1973/1993) *Dialekty polskie*, 2nd rev. ed. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Fici, Francesca. (2009) “Periphrastic constructions”. Sebastian Kempgen, Peter Kosta, Tilman Berger, and Karl Gutschmidt, eds. *Die slavischen Sprachen: Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung*, vol. 1. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 200–209.
- Fleischman, Suzanne. (1983) “From pragmatics to grammar”. *Lingua* 60(2–3): 183–214.
- Flier, Michael S. (1978) “On the velar infinitive in East Slavic”. Henrik Birnbaum, ed. *American contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, 269–306.
- Fontans’kij, Henryk. (2004) “Lemkovyna”. Paul R. Magocsi, ed. *Rusyns’kij jazŷk*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski, Instytut Filologii Polskiej, 211–62.
- Franks, Steven and Tracy Holloway King. (2000) *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gebauer, Jan. (1898) *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého*, vol. 3(2): *Časováni*. Prague: F. Tempský.
- Gerovskij, Georg. (1929) “Zur Behandlung der Lautverbindungen -dl-, -tl- im Südkarpatorussischen (Ugrorussischen)”. *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 6: 77–85.
- Greene, David. (1979) “Perfects and perfectives”. *Ériu* 30: 122–41.
- Gunnarsson, Gunnar. (1935) *Studien über die Stellung des Reflexivs im Russischen*. Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistka Bokhandeln.

- Hancov, Vsevolod. (1924) "Dijalektolohična klasyfikacija ukrajins'kyx hovoriv". *Zapysky istoryčno-filolohičnoho viddilu VUAN* 4: 80–144.
- Hanudel', Zuzanna. (1994) "Terytorial'ne členuvannja leksyčnoji systemy ukrajins'kyx hovirok Sxidnoji Slovaččyny". P. Ju. Hrycenko, ed. *Problemy sučasnoji areolohiji*. Kiev: Naukova dumka, 95–101.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. (2006) *The changing languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jabur, Vasyľ and Anna Pliškova. (2007) "Prjašivs'ka Rus'". Paul R. Magocsi, ed. *Rusyns'kyj jazýk*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski, Instytut Filologii Polskiej, 147–209.
- Jagić, Vatroslav. (1916) "[Review of] Materialy dlja istorii ugorskoj Rusi. VII. Pamjatniki cerkovno-religioznoj žizni Ugorossov XVI–XVII v. Teksty. A. Petrov. SPb 1914. VI. 295". *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 36: 496–504.
- Jakobson, Roman. (1935) "Les enclitiques slaves". Bruno Migliorini and Vittore Pisani, eds. *Atti del III Congresso Internazionale dei Linguisti (Roma, 19–26 Settembre 1933–XI)*. Florence: Felice le Monnier, 384–90.
- Kerča, Igor'. (2004) "Pudkarpats'ka Rus'". Paul R. Magocsi, ed. *Rusyns'kyj jazýk*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski, Instytut Filologii Polskiej, 115–46.
- Kernyc'kyj, I. M. (1967) *Systema slovozmyny v ukrajins'kij movi*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
- Klemensiewicz, Zenon. (1974) *Historia języka polskiego*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Kobyljans'kyj, Bronyslav. (1928) "Hucul's'kyj hovir i joho vidnošennja do hovoru Pokuttja". *Ukrajins'kyj dijalektolohičnyj zbirnyk*, vol. 1. Kiev: Ukrajins'ka Akademija Nauk, 1–92.
- Křížková, Helena. (1960) *Vývoj opisného futura v jazycích slovanských, zvláště v ruštině*. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství. [*Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis. Fakultas Philosophica* 4. *Philologica* 11.]
- Kuraszkiewicz, Władysław. (1939) "Review of Ivan Pan'kevyč. Ukrajins'ki hovory Pidkarpats'koji Rusy i sumežnyx oblastej [...]. V Praze 1938. Str. xxxiii + 546". *Rocznik slawistyczny* 15: 84–103.
- Kurylo, Olena. (1920/1960) *Uvahy do sučasnoji ukrajins'koji movy*, 5th ed. Toronto: Novi Dni.
- Kurzová, Helena. (1999) "Syntax in the Indo-European morphosyntactic type". Carol F. Justus and Edgar C. Polomé, eds. *Language*

- change and typological variation: In honor of Winfred P. Lehmann on the occasion of his 83rd birthday*, vol. 2: *Grammatical universals and typology*. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 501–20.
- Kurzowa, Zofia. (1988) "Nowe uwagi o genezie i chronologii czasu przeszłego na *-ch*". *Język polski* 68(4–5): 203–10.
- . (1993) *Język polski wileńszczyzny i kresów północno-wschodnich XVI–XX w.* Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Latta, Vasyľ. (1991) *Atlas ukrajins'kyx hovoriv Sxidnoji Slovaččyny*. Bratislava: Slovac'ke pedahohične vydavnyctvo.
- Levin-Steinmann, Anke. (2010) *Studien zur Grammatikalisierung*. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač. [PHILOLOGICA. Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungsergebnisse, 143.]
- Marčylo, L. M. (1997) "Z istoriji skladnyx form majbutnjoho času v ukrajins'kij movi". *Systema i struktura sxidnoslov"jans'kyx mov*. Kiev: Ukrajins'kyj deržavnyj pedahohičnyj universytet im. M. P. Drahomanova, 20–26.
- . (2001) "Do istoriji analityčnyx form majbutnjoho času nedokonanoho vydu". *Problemy hramatyky i leksykologiji ukrajins'koji movy*, Vol. 1. Kiev: Ukrajins'kyj deržavnyj pedahohičnyj universytet im. M. P. Drahomanova, 74–79.
- . (2006a) "Zi sposterežen' nad časovymy formamy dijeslova u pam"jatkax XVIII st". *Problemy hramatyky i leksykologiji ukrajins'koji movy*, Vol. 2. Kiev: Ukrajins'kyj deržavnyj pedahohičnyj universytet im. M. P. Drahomanova. 147–57.
- . (2006b) "Analityčni ta syntetyčni formy majbutnjoho času nedokonanoho vydu v dilovij movi XVII st". *Istorija ta sučasnyj stan funkcionuvannja hramatyčnoji systemy ukrajins'koji movy*. Čerkasy: Brama-Ukraina, 80–86.
- Matvijas, I. H., I. O. Varčenko, P. Ju. Hrycenko, F. T. Žylko, Ja. V. Zakrevs'ka, N. Jo. Marčuk, T. V. Nazarova, and N. P. Prylypko. (1984) *Atlas ukrajins'koji movy*. 1: *Polissja, Serednja Naddnibrjanščyna i sumižni zemli*. (1988) 2: *Volyn', Naddnistrjanščyna i sumižni zemli*. (2001) 3: *Slobožanščyna, Doneččyna, Nyžnja Naddnibrjanščyna, Pryčornomor"ja i sumižni zemli*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
- Meillet, Antoine. (1924) *Le slave commun*. Paris: E. Champion.
- Mykhaylyk, Roksolana. (2010) "Diachronic universals and morpheme order in the Ukrainian synthetic imperfective future". *Morphology* 20: 359–80.

- Ogonowski, Emil. (1880) *Studien auf dem Gebiete der ruthenischen Sprache*. L'viv: Ševčenko-Verein.
- Ohijenko, Ivan. (1930) *Ukrajins'ka literaturna mova XVI-ho st. i Krexiivs'kyj Apostol 1560-x r.* Warsaw: Drukarnja synodal'na.
- Pan'kevyč, Ivan. (1928) "Kil'ka zamitok do ostanku aorysta v zakarpats'kyx hovorax". *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenko*, 141–43: 1–5.
- . (1938) *Ukrajins'ki hovory Pidkarpats'koji Rusy i sumežnyx oblastej*, part 1: *Zvučnja i morfolohija*. Prague: Orbis. [Knihovna Sboru pro výzkum Slovenska a Podkarpatské Rusi při Slovanském Ústavu v Praze, 9.]
- Petrov, Aleksej, ed. (1921) *Materialy dlja istorii ugarskoj Rusi. VII: Pamjatniki cerkovno-religioznoj žizni ugorosov XVI–XVII vv. I. Poučenijska na evangelie po Njagovskomu spisku 1758 g. II. Iereja Mixaila "Oborona vėrnomu č(o)l(o)v(ě)ku"*. Teksty. St. Petersburg: Akademičeskaja tipografija.
- Piper, Predrag, ed. (2009) *Južnoslovenski jezici: gramatičke strukture i funkcije*. Belgrade: Beogradska knjiga.
- Pivtorak, H. P. (2000) "Pryholosni zvuky". V. M. Rusanivs'kyj and O. O. Taranenko, eds. *Ukrajins'ka mova. Encyklopedija*. Kiev: Ukrainins'ka encyklopedija, 484–85.
- Potebnja, A. A. (1888/1958) *Iz zapisok po ruskoj grammatike*, vol. 1–2. Moscow: Učpedgiz.
- Pugh, Stefan M. (2011) "The place of Rusyn in the East Slavic linguistic continuum". Andriy Danylenko and Serhii Vakulenko, eds. *Studien zu Sprache und Literatur bei den Slaven. Gedenkschrift für George Y. Shevelov zum 100. Geburtstag*. Munich: Otto Sagner, 189–211.
- Rospond, Stanisław. (1971) *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*. Warsaw: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.
- Shevelov, George Y. (1965) *A prehistory of Slavic*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . (1977) "Jesmi 'I am' and some verbal endings in Slavic". Benjamin A. Stolz, ed. *Papers in Slavic philology 1: In Honor of James Ferrell*. Ann Arbor, MI, 249–57.
- . (1979) *A historical phonology of the Ukrainian language*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- . (1989) *The Ukrainian language in the first half of the twentieth century (1900–1941). Its state and status*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.

- Shevelov, George Y. (1993) "Ukrainian". Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett, eds. *The Slavonic languages*. London: Routledge, 947–98.
- Simovyč, Vasyľ (1918/1919). *Hramatyka ukrajins'koji movy: Dlja samonavčannja v dopomohu škil'nij nauči*, 2nd rev. ed. Kiev: Ukr. nakladnja.
- Smerečyns'kyj, Serhij. (1932) *Narysy z ukrajins'koji syntaksy*. Xarkiv: Radjans'ka škola.
- Sobolevskij, A. I. (1888/1907) *Lekcii po istorii russkogo jazyka*, 4th ed. Moscow: Universitetskaja tipografija.
- Stanislav, Ján. (1958) *Dejiny slovenského jazyka*, vol. 2: *Tvaroslovie*. Bratislava: Slovenska akadémia vied.
- Štolc, Jozef et al., eds. (1981) *Atlas slovenského jazyka*. Vol. 2: *Flexia*, part 1: *Mapy*. Bratislava: Veda.
- Synjavs'kyj, Oleksa. (1931/1967) *Normy ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy*. State College, PA.
- Urbańczyk, S. (1953) *Zarys dialektologii polskiej*. Warsaw: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.
- Vážný, Václav. (1926) "O dialektických slovenských tvarech slovesných na -ch". *Mnéma. Sborník vydaný na paměť čtyřicítiletého učitelského pusobení Prof. Josefa Zubatého na universitě Karlově. 1885–1925*. Prague, 329–38.
- Večerka, Radoslav. (1993) *Altkichenslavische (altbulgarische) syntax*, vol. 2: *Die innere Satzstruktur*. Freiburg im Breisgau: U.W. Weiher-Freiburg I. Br.
- Verxratskyj, Ivan. (1899) *Znadoby dlja piznannja uhorsko-ruskyx hovoriv*. L'viv: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Ševčenko.
- . (1902) *Pro hovor halyckyx lemkiu*. L'viv. [*Zbirnyk filjoljogičnoji sekciji Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenko*, 5].
- Vondrák, W. (1908) *Vergleichende Slavische Grammatik*, vol. 2: *Formenlehre und Syntax*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Vyxovanec', Ivan and Kateryna Horodens'ka. (2004) *Teoretyčna morfolohija ukrajins'koji movy*. Kiev: Pul'sary.
- Xaburgaev, G. A. (1978) "Sud'ba vspomogatel'nogo glagola drevnix slavjanskix analitičeskix form v russkom jazyke". *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Serija filologija* 4: 42–53.
- Zalijnjak, A. A. (2008) *Drevnerusskie ènklitiki*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskix kul'tur.

- Žylko, F. T. (1955/1966) *Narysy z dialektolohiji ukrajins'koji movy*, 2nd rev. ed. Kiev: Radjans'ka škola.
- Zwicky, Arnold and Geoffrey Pullum. (1983) "Cliticization vs. inflection: English *n't*". *Language* 59(3): 502–13.

Modern Languages and Cultures
Pace University
41 Park Row, 11th floor, Room 1116
New York, NY, 10038 USA
adanylenko@pace.edu

Received: March 2010
Revised: December 2010