

Preprint. Please cite the later online version:

Breu, Walter, "Paucal", in: Encyclopedia of Slavic Languages and Linguistics Online, Editor-in-Chief Marc L. Greenberg. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2589-6229_ESLO_COM_031985>

First published online: 2020

ABSTRACT

The paucal is described here as a bound number grammeme, historically derived from the dual and present in modern Russian, Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian and Molise Slavic. The article gives an overview of the definition and the distribution of the paucal in Slavic, as well as its grammatical status and its historical development. Special chapters deal with the paucal in nouns, attributes, predicates, and in oblique cases in the three languages under consideration.

TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITION

The paucal (< La *paucus* 'few'), required by the numerals '2, 3, 4' and 'both', may be considered a grammeme of the category of →number, with singular and plural as its counterparts, just like the →dual, from which it is historically derived. Alternative terms are Ge *Numerativ* (Isačenko 1962), Ru <onl>счётная форма</onl> *sčëtnaja forma* (Vinogradov 1972, Zaliznjak 2002) or Sr <onl>мала множина</onl> *mala množina* (Piper 2005 ~ <onl>наукал</onl> *paukal*), Cr *malina* (Znika 2002 ~ *paukal*), En *restricted plural* (Corbett 2000 ~ *paucal*). The terms *dvojina* and *dual*, frequent in BCMS handbooks for the *paucal*, are misleading.

In opposition to the singular, the dual, just like the paucal, refers to more than one referent, but not to a larger quantity like the plural. In modern Slavic languages, the paucal and the dual are mutually exclusive, with the paucal referring to two–four referents and the dual to just two. In historical times, however, variation between these two numbers and even with the (unmarked) plural was not excluded (Žolobov and Krys'ko 2001). Other languages of the world either have a reduced inventory or show even more number grammemes like a trial, a greater plural etc. or no number category at all (Corbett 2000: 22–53).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PAUCAL IN SLAVIC

In the modern Slavic standard languages, the paucal is found only in →Russian and in the →BCMS standard varieties, whereas the →Čakavian (bound dual) and the →Kajkavian (only plural) dialect are different (Belić 1972: 54–57). In contrast, →Molise Slavic (MSL), a Slavic micro-language in southern Italy, has preserved a paucal in its grammatical system, too, despite very strong Romance influences in other fields of grammar during the last 500 years (Breu 2017). MSL has the same genetic roots as BCMS, but on a →Štokavian-Ikavian dialectal basis. In →Bulgarian and →Macedonian a still wider expansion of the original dual took place, including not only the numerals '3–4', but all numbers, thus transforming it not to a paucal but to Bg <onl>бройна</onl> *brojna* / Mk <onl>избројана форма</onl> *izbrojana forma* 'enumerative form' as a third (bound) number grammeme besides singular and plural, except for nouns referring to persons (Andrejčin et al. 1977: 122, Koneski 1982: 245–250, Kahl und Metzeltin 2015: 85, 87). As for the standard languages, →Slovene,

→Lower Sorbian and →Upper Sorbian have preserved the dual, with only the genitive and, partially, the locative forms being replaced by those of the plural. The larger rest of the Slavic languages has lost the third number grammeme altogether, notwithstanding individual plural endings of some nouns going back to the dual, like BCMS *rùkū* (~ *rúkā*) (GEN.PL.F), Cz *rukou* ‘hands’, BCMS *rùkama* (DAT/INS/LOC.PL.F), Ru <onl>глаза</onl> *glazá* ‘eyes’ (NOM/ACC.PL.M).

NOUNS IN THE PAUCAL

In modern Russian the paucal endings of all nouns, irrespective of their gender, coincide with those of the GEN.SG. Only very few masculine paucals like <onl>шага</onl> *šag-á* (PC of <onl>шаг</onl> *šag* ‘step’) or <onl>часа</onl> *čas-á* (PC of <onl>час</onl> *čas* ‘hour’) are different from the corresponding GEN.SG (<onl>шага</onl> *šág-a*, <onl>часа</onl> *čas-a*) with respect to the position of stress. Note that this group of suprasegmentally marked exceptions comprises the only paucal forms in their own right, not coinciding with any other form in the paradigm of Russian nouns. Otherwise paucal stress is in all genders on the same syllable as in the GEN.SG. Where the GEN.SG ending segmentally coincides with the NOM.PL (and ACC.PL), which regularly happens in the case of feminine and neuter nouns, much less so of masculines, it may nevertheless differ in the position of stress: <onl>сестры</onl> *sěstr-y* ‘sisters’ (NOM.PL.F) : <onl>две сестры</onl> *dve sestr-ý* ‘two sisters’ (PC = GEN.SG), <onl>окна</onl> *ókn-a* ‘windows’ (NOM.PL.N) : <onl>два окна</onl> *dva okn-á* ‘two windows’ (PC = GEN.SG), <onl>города</onl> *gorod-á* ‘towns’ (NOM.PL.M) : <onl>два города</onl> *dva górod-a* ‘two towns’ (PC = GEN.SG). In Russian, paucal forms apply only in NOM and ACC position, otherwise the plural is used. With nouns referring to persons, less so to animals, the paucal form in object position is, however, normally replaced by the ACC.PL, e.g. <onl>Я вижу двух сестер и трех сыновей</onl> *Ja vižu dvux sestër i trëx syn-ovej* ‘I see two sisters and three sons’ (ACC=GEN.PL); cf. Švedova et al. (1980: 575–576), Mulisch et al. (1988: 245–249), Igartua and Madariaga (2018) and →Differential object marking, →Differential argument marking.

In BCMS only masculine and neuter paucal forms coincide with the GEN.SG, whereas the feminine paucal is homonymous with the NOM.PL, even suprasegmentally (stress, pitch, vowel quantity), e.g. *grād-ovi* ‘towns’ (NOM.PL.M) : *dvâ grād-a* (PC = GEN.SG), *sěl-a* ‘villages’ (NOM.PL.N) : *dvâ sěl-a* (PC = GEN.SG), but *dvÿje/dvê žèn-e* ‘two women’ (PC = NOM.PL.F) : *žèn-ē* (GEN.SG) (Raguž 1987, Piper 2005: 884).

The same distribution as in BCMS is valid, in principle, for MSL, too, but with the difference that it has lost its neuter nouns, e.g. (in a phonological notation following BCSM usage) *grād-ā* ‘villages’ (NOM.PL.M) : *dvâ grād-a* ‘two villages’ (PC = GEN.SG), *dvÿ žén-e* ‘two women’ (PC = NOM.PL) : *žèn-ē* (GEN.SG); cf. Breu (2015: 12–13, 2017: 131, 240, 268).

Higher simple numerals of all genders from ‘5’ onwards require the GEN.PL in all three languages, e.g. Ru <onl>пять сестер</onl> *pjat’ sestër*, <onl>окон</onl>, *ókon* <onl>городов</onl> *gorod-óv* ‘five sisters, windows, towns’ (GEN.PL), BCMS *pêt grād-ōvā*, *sělā*, *žén-ā* (GEN.PL), MSL *pêt grād-ī*, *žên* ‘five towns, women’ (GEN.PL). Compound

numerals follow the same rules as their last component, e.g. Ru <onl>двадцать два столá</onl> ‘*dvadcat’ dva stol-á* ‘22 tables’ (PC = GEN.SG.M), <onl>сто три кни́ги</onl> *sto tri kníg-i* ‘103 books’ (PC = GEN.SG.F), but *dvadcat’ odin stol* ‘21 tables’ <onl>двадцать один стол</onl> (NOM.SG.M), <onl>двадцать пять столóв</onl> *dvadcat’ pjat’ stol-óv* ‘25 tables’ (GEN.PL.M).

ATTRIBUTES AND SUBSTANTIVIZED ADJECTIVES IN THE PAUCAL

As for Russian adjectives in paucal contexts, their endings do not coincide with those of the GEN.SG, contrary to the nouns. They mostly show the GEN.PL, e.g. <onl>два старых столá</onl> *dva star-ux stol-á* ‘two old chairs’, <onl>два старых окнá</onl> *dva star-ux okn-á* ‘two old windows’. This is also true for substantivized adjectives in paucal position, as in <onl>два рабочих</onl> *dva raboč-ix* ‘two workers’, <onl>два существительных</onl> *dva suščestvitel’n-ux* ‘two nouns’. There is, however, an exception, namely, when the adjective attributes a feminine noun with a paucal (= GEN.SG) whose stress coincides with that of the NOM.PL. In this case the NOM.PL of the adjective is preferred: <onl>две старые комнаты</onl> *dve star-ye kómnat-y* ‘two old rooms’ (GEN.SG = NOM.PL). Otherwise the regular solution is the GEN.PL, e.g. <onl>две старых сестры́</onl> *dve star-ux sestr-ý* ‘two old sisters’ (GEN.SG ≠ <onl>сестры</onl> *séstr-y* NOM.PL). In this case and even with masculines and neuters the older NOM.PL form is still possible in stylistically marked texts. That said, the opposite way of using the GEN.PL throughout is not excluded either, though again stylistically marked. Feminine substantivized adjectives also vary, e.g. <onl>две занятых</onl> *dve zapjat-ýx* (~<onl>занятые</onl> *zapjat-ýe*) ‘two commas’. As for adjectives (and pronouns) preposed to paucal numerals, two groups have to be differentiated: “determiners” like Ru <onl>этом</onl> *ét-ot* ‘this’, <onl>последний</onl> *posledn-ij* ‘last’ are in the NOM.PL, while “prequantifiers” like <onl>целый</onl> *cel-uj* ‘whole’, <onl>полный</onl> *poln-uj* ‘full’ are in the GEN.PL, e.g. <onl>последние два дня</onl> *posledn-ie*:NOM.PL *dva dnj-a* ‘the last two days’ vs. <onl>целых два дня</onl> *cel-ux*:GEN.PL *dva dnj-a* ‘two whole days’ (Mulisch et al. 1980: 247).

In BCMS the situation is different, as masculine and neuter adjectives agree with the noun in using a paucal of the GEN.SG type, e.g. *dva dobr-a*:PC *čovек-a*:PC ‘two good men’. The form *dobra*, however, is not the ordinary (definite) genitive, which would be *dobr-og(a)*, but always the short (indefinite) one (→Definiteness (morphological)). What is more, it is even suprasegmentally different from the ordinary indefinite form when the paucal of definite adjectives is required. Here the ending is a long *-ā*, e.g. *dva dobr-ā čovek-a* ‘two good men’. A paucal form like *dobr-ā* does not coincide with any GEN.SG form, but rather with the definite neuter plural (for masculines and neuters alike). This peculiarity, differentiating the paucal of attributes from the indefinite GEN.SG, is only rarely dealt with in BCMS grammars, but see Raguš (1997: 90, 109). Franks (1995: 125) mentions an additional suprasegmental opposition, whose systematic status is still unclear: *cŕn-a* as the indefinite vs. *cŕn-a* as the definite paucal of *cŕn* ‘black’. With feminine nouns under paucal conditions attributes agree in case and number (NOM.PL), e.g. *dvije/dve dobr-e žen-e* ‘two good women’. At-

tributes (determiners) of masculine and neuter nouns preposed to paucal numerals always require a paucal form of the GEN.SG type, too, e.g. *sva:PC ta:PC četiri nov-a:PC student-a:PC.M* ‘all those four new students’, *ta:PC dva pism-a:PC.N* ‘those two letters’. See Franks (1995: 93–129) for more details and for an overall comparison of the grammar of numerals in BCMS and Russian.

In MSL the NOM.PL (= ACC.PL) ending is the only possibility for adjectives and pronouns of both genders, either preposed or postponed to paucal numerals. Note that this is true irrespective of the position of the attribute before or after the noun, e.g. *on-e:NOM.PL dva dobr-e:NOM.PL ljud-ata:PC* ‘those two good men’, *naš-e:NOM.PL dva kafel-a:PC tepl-e:NOM.PL* ‘our two hot coffees’, *dvi lip-e:NOM.PL žen-e:NOM.PL.F* ‘two beautiful women’, *dvi žen-e:NOM.PL.F star-e:NOM.PL* ‘two old women’ (Breu 2015: 12–13).

THE PAUCAL IN PREDICATES

In Russian, there is no special form for the paucal of predicates. Only plural forms apply (apart from the NOM.SG.N in impersonal usage), e.g. <onl>два человека были задержаны</onl> *Dva čelovek-a:PC byl-i:PTCP.PL zadržan-y:NOM.PL, kogda on-i...* ‘Two men were arrested, when they...’. The same is true for MSL: *dva ljud-ata:PC su bil:PTCP.PL reštan-e:NOM.PL, kada on-e...*

In BCMS the situation is different. Here, as a rule, special forms in *-a*, corresponding to the attributive ones, agree with the paucal of masculines and neuters, formally homonymous for both genders with the GEN.SG and the NOM.PL.N., eg. *sv-a:PC ta:PC četiri nov-a:PC student-a:PC.M su:AUX.PRS.3PL čekal-a:PC* ‘all those four new students have waited’, *oba su:AUX.PRS.3PL pism-a:PC.N pročitan-a:PC* ‘both letters are/have been read’. Such a mixture of "agreement" patterns of gender, case and number speaks in favor of the paucal to be treated not in terms of its syncretism with other forms of the singular and plural paradigms, but as a grammeme of its own. Feminine predicates in paucal constructions agree with the feminine plural of the noun: *obje su:AUX.PRS.3PL žen-e:NOM.PL.F prošl-e:PTCP.PL.F* ‘both women passed’ (Raguž 1997: 350–351, Piper 2005: 884).

OBLIQUE CASES

In Russian the paucal is replaced by inflected plural forms in the oblique cases, e.g. <onl>двух столов</onl> *dvux:PL stol-ov:GEN.PL* ‘of two tables’, <onl>с двумя столами</onl> *s dvumja:INS stol-ami:INS.PL* ‘with two tables’.

The same is true, in principle, for BCSM, too, e.g. *t-ih triju narod-ā* ‘of those three peoples’ (GEN.PL), *slično dvama stupov-ima* ‘similar to two columns’ (DAT.PL). But especially (though not exclusively) in combination with prepositions, such a substitution is very rare, which means that the paucal as an uninflected form of the type *s tri nov-a:PC student-a:PC* ‘with three new students’ (instead of the INS.PL *s trima student-ima*) may be used in all case positions (Barić et. al. 1997: 216–217, Piper 2005: 885). This is not a recent development, as show examples from the 15th century onwards (Belić 1972: 62). The usage of the (uninflected) paucal in all cases strengthens its po-

sition in the paradigm in favor of a number grammeme and to the detriment of its conception as a case grammeme (Piper 2005: 884–887).

In MSL the uninflected paucal may be used optionally in all cases, too, but at least in the INS.PL inflection prevails, though often with the noun following the paucal numeral in the GEN.PL: *do dva grad-a:PC=GEN.SG* ‘of two villages’ ~ *do dvi-hi:GEN grad-i:GEN.PL*; *s dva grad-a:PC=GEN.SG* ‘with two villages’ ~ *s dva-mi:INS grad-ami:INS.PL* ~ *s dva-mi:INS grad-i:GEN.PL*. Attributes may be in the NOM.PL in all instances, but when the numeral is inflected, the GEN.PL and the corresponding oblique case form are also possible, e.g. *s dvi-mi žen-ami star-e:NOM.PL* ~ *star-ih:GEN.PL* ~ *star-imi:INS.PL* ‘with two old women’.

GRAMMATICAL STATUS OF THE PAUCAL

From a theoretical point of view the status of the Slavic paucal is controversial, as it is not a free grammeme of its own, but appears only in combination with paucal numerals. It is thus a "bound grammeme". This is why some linguists exclude it from the number system (Corbett 2000: 22). But such an opinion is problematic, as long as bound grammemes of other categories are not treated in the same way, like, for example, the locative/prepositive case, always combined with a preposition. Another example is the dual in colloquial Upper Sorbian, which is only a bound grammeme, too, since the presence of the numeral ‘2’ is as indispensable here as is the presence of paucal numerals for the paucal (Scholze 2008: 126–138).

Another problem for the grammatical status of the paucal is its restriction to the NOM and ACC, with the plural replacing it in all other cases, especially in Russian. However, we could also claim a syncretism of paucal and plural in these cases, finding their parallel in case syncretism (e.g. of DAT and LOC.SG in the *a*-declension), in gender syncretism (e.g. of neuter and masculine in all cases except NOM and ACC), and even in the number syncretism of DU and PL in the Upper Sorbian and Slovene genitive.

In view of such difficulties, other solutions have been put forward, like that of considering the Russian paucal a case grammeme (Isačenko 1962: 530, Franks 1995: 105, Zaliznjak 2002: 46–48). For BCMS Piper (2005: 885) strongly rejects such a claim. In addition, Piper (2005: 884) argues in favor of not simply mixing up the paucal with homonymous forms of the paradigm, like the GEN.SG and the NOM.PL.N. This analysis is supported by the morphologically independent adjectival paucal forms in *-ā*, put forward by Raguž (1997), but not addressed in Piper (2005). Even for Russian with fewer agreement problems, but with some explicitly paucal noun forms, Vinogradov (1972: 238, 244–245) argues that analyzing the paucal as a GEN.SG form is not justified in the system of case forms and functions. Isačenko (1962: 530) even considers it a "Vergewaltigung der Tatsachen" (‘violation of facts’).

The Slavic paucal gives rise to theoretical problems in the domain of government and agreement, too. On the one hand, the noun is governed by the paucal numeral for number, but on the other hand there is agreement in gender between the noun and the paucal numeral ‘2’ (and ‘both’), with *dva* for M and N, but *dve*, *dvije*, *dvi* for feminines (Mel’čuk 1985, Corbett 1993, Franks 1995: 100–102).

THE HISTORY OF THE PAUCAL

The Slavic paucal indisputably goes back to the NOM/ACC of the dual, losing its original function of referring to two or to paired objects both as a free and a bound number grammeme. Researchers disagree as to whether the loss of the free dual begins from the 11th century onwards (cf. Žolobov and Kryš'ko 2000: 95-96, arguing against Belić 1932 and Jordanskij 1960). Obviously, the paucal developed in those languages, in which the bound dual of the nouns extended its domain to the numerals '3' and '4'. Just like '2' (and 'both'), these numerals differed from the higher ones in functioning as attributes of the nouns, agreeing with them for number, case and gender, while higher numerals had the character of quantitative nouns, governing the GEN.PL.

Morphologically the numerals '2–4' differed from those indicating '≥ 5' in having their own inflection types. When the bound dual started becoming, in principle, a variant of the plural, the dual forms could completely disappear or they could be mixed up with plural forms, thus entering the domain of the numerals '3' and '4'. At the same time, mutual analogical influence occurred in the morphology of these numerals themselves, e.g. Ru <onl>дѣвоу</onl> *děvoju* '2' GEN > <onl>дѣух</onl> *dvux*, influenced by <onl>мрѣхѣ</onl> *trěxě*, BCMS *trěmi* '3' INS > *trima*, by adapting to *děvěma* (Unbegaun 1935: 410–415, Belić 1972: 181–184).

Several steps contributed to the passage of the dual to the paucal. Their relative diachrony is not quite clear, as historic documents do not contradict the assumption of a long-lasting coexistence of older and newer forms as variants. The most important steps after the gradual loss of the free dual are listed here. They could perhaps, indeed, be understood as a diachronic sequence, starting in both languages more or less in the 13th century (Belić 1932; 1972: 54–64, 181–185, Jordanskij 1960, Kiparsky 1967, Suprun 1969, Žolobov and Kryš'ko 2001, Ambrosiani 2004) and coming to an end only in the 18th century (or even later), for example with respect to the GEN.PL form of the attributes in Russian (Suprun 1969: 167):

- 1) mixing up dual and plural forms of nouns combined with the numerals '2, 3, 4'
- 2) replacing the neuter numeral *dvě* by masculine *dva*
- 3) re-analyzing the ending *-a* of the NOM/ACC.PL of neuter nouns in combination with paucal numerals as a GEN.SG governed by the latter
- 4) re-analyzing the ending *-a* of the NOM/ACC.DU of masculine nouns as GEN.SG
- 5) re-analyzing the endings of the NOM/ACC of feminines headed by paucal numerals as GEN.SG
- 6) readjustment of the NOM/ACC.PL of attributes and determiners of paucal NPs
- 7) readjustment of the NOM/ACC.PL of predicates referring to paucal NPs

Note that in the changes 3) and 4) stress alternations played a role (Šaxmatov 1957: 330–332, Ambrosiani 2004: 134–136). After them the paucal required exclusively the suprasegmental characteristics of the GEN.SG. The first four changes show the same results in all three languages under consideration (but not necessarily their dialects). In the case of MSL they still correspond to the actual configuration today, i. e. no special government of the paucal neither for feminine nouns nor for all attributes

and predicates, conserving thus, possibly, the common Štokavian situation of the 16th century.

The subsequent developments were language-specific. Change 5) occurred only in Russian and only when there was a difference in the position of stress. Change 6) had different effects. In BCMS a form in *-a* was introduced, homonymous with the GEN.SG of the indefinite adjectives, but becoming rather independent in being the base also for a long *-ā* in the definite paucal and by spreading – in 7) – to determiners and predicates and even to verb forms (PTCP in *-l*), where they cannot be conceived as GEN.SG, giving rise to the somewhat contradictory opinion in grammar books of claiming it a neuter NOM.PL even for the masculines. It also invaded attributes preceding paucal numbers.

In Russian step 6) supported the overall replacement of the form of the attributes to the GEN.PL in analogy to the numerals '≥ 5'. Only the feminines, not touched by 5) because of their stress configuration, remained in the NOM.PL. Attributes and determiners preceding the numeral had their own idiosyncratic developments.

It should be added that all of the modifications and rearrangements 1) – 4) in their entirety were indispensable for the development of the paucal. For example, in those languages, in which *dvě* continued to refer to neuter nouns, it did not happen. And where *dva* could not be identified with a genitive ending in *-a* in the masculines, as in Polish with its large number of *u*-genitives for inanimate masculines, it did not develop either, in spite of *dwa* passing over to the neuters (and a new form *dwaj* for male adult persons). Polish influence in the second half of the 14th century could also have been responsible for the western dialects of Old East Slavic (as the basis of Ukrainian and Belarusian) not continuing the Russian way (Suprun 1969, Žolobov and Kryś'ko 2001: 209,).

THE RUDIMENTARY PAUCAL OF UKRAINIAN

Part of the diachrony of Russian is also valid for Ukrainian, which, actually, shows some elements of a rudimentary paucal, too, though they are not explicitly treated as such in Ukrainian grammars and textbooks. According to the general rule, with the numbers '2–4' the nominative plural is used (like in Polish). Some authors, however, sporadically mention lexically restricted forms governed by '2–4', coinciding in case of stem alternations with the genitive singular, e.g. <onl>два ока</onl> *dva oka* ≠ <onl>очи</onl> *oči* NOM.PL.N 'eye', <onl>два імені</onl> *dva imeni* ≠ <onl>імена</onl> *imena* NOM.PL.N 'name', <onl>два киянина</onl> *dva kyjanyna* ≠ <onl>кияни</onl> *kyjany* NOM.PL.M 'Kiev citizen'. Others claim a stress assignment corresponding to that of the genitive singular whenever nominative plural stress differs from it, irrespective of the ending, e.g. <onl>два вікна</onl> *dva vikná* ≠ <onl>ві́кна</onl> *víkna*, NOM.PL.N 'field', <onl>дві сестри</onl> *dvi sestry* ≠ <onl>сестри</onl> *sestry* NOM.PL.F 'sister', <onl>два брати</onl> *dva bráty* ≠ <onl>бра́ти</onl> *bratý* NOM.PL.M (≠ GEN.SG <onl>бра́та</onl> *bráta*) 'brother'. Attributive adjectives with '2–4' appear optionally in the GEN.PL, e.g. <onl>два гірські</onl> *dva hirs'kí* (NOM.PL) ~ <onl>два гірських</onl> *hirs'kýx* (GEN.PL) <onl>озера</onl> *ózera* (= GEN.SG.N) 'two mountain lakes'. There are also

cases of a non-normative influence of the Russian paucal in examples like <onl>два дня</onl> *dva dnja* instead of <onl>два дни</onl> *dva dni* ‘day’, even leading to a rare analogical use of the genuine Ukrainian genitive singular of the type <onl>два року</onl> *dva roku* instead of <onl>два року</onl> *dva roky* ‘year’; cf. Bilodid (1969: 253), Dolenko (1974: 196), Rusanovski (1986: 148, 276), Dudik (1988: 265), Troškina (2001: 165), Schubert (2008: 110), Heck (2019).

REFERENCES

- Ambrosiani, Per. 2004. Review of Žolobov and Kryš'ko (2001). *Russian Linguistics* 28, 131–136.
- Andrejčin, Ljubomir et al. 1977. *Gramatika na bałgarskija ezik*. Sofija.
- Barić, Eugenija et al. 1997. *Hrvatska gramatika*. Zagreb.
- Belić, Aleksandar. 1932. *O dvojini u slovenskim jezicima*. Beograd.
- Belić, Aleksandar. 1972. *Istorija srpskohrvatskog jezika. Knj. II Sv. 1: Reči sa deklinacijom*. Beograd.
- Bilodid, I. K. (ed.) 1969. *Sučasna ukraïns'ka literaturna mova (II). Morfolohija*. Kyïv: Naukova Dumka. Kyïv: Vyšča Škola.
- Breu, Walter. 2015. Zahlen im totalen Sprachkontakt: Das komplexe System der Numeralia im Moliseslavischen. In: Tilmann Reuther (ed.), *Slavistische Linguistik 2012*. München, 7–34.
- Breu, Walter. 2017. *Slavische Mikrosprachen im absoluten Sprachkontakt. Band I. Moliseslavische Texte aus Acquaviva Collecroce, Montemitro und San Felice del Molise*. Wiesbaden.
- Corbett, Greville G. 1993. The head of Russian numeral expressions. In: Greville G. Corbett et al. (eds.), *Heads in Grammatical Theory*. Cambridge, 11–35.
- Corbett, Greville G. 2000. *Number*. Cambridge.
- Dolenko, M. T. 1974. Čyslivnyk. In: *Sučasna ukraïns'ka mova. Vydannja druhe, dopovnene i pereroblene*. Kyïv: Vyšča Škola, 193–197.
- Dudik, P. S. (ed.) 1988. *Ukraïns'ka mova. Častyna 1*. Kyïv: Vyšča Škola.
- Franks, Steven. 1995. *Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. Oxford.
- Heck, Stefan. 2019. *Die Paukalkonstruktion im Ukrainischen. 2,3,4 + (Adj) + N*. Talk given at the “XLV. Konstanzer Slavistisches Arbeitstreffen”, 13/09/2019. Tübingen: University.
- Igartua, Iván and Nerea Madariaga. 2018. The interplay of semantic and formal factors in Russian morphosyntax: animate paucal constructions in direct object function. *Russian Linguistics* 42, 27–55.
- Isačenko, A. V. 1962. *Die russische Sprache der Gegenwart. Teil I. Formenlehre*. Halle.
- Jordanskij, A. M. 1960. *Istorija dvojstvennogo čisla v russkom jazyke*. Vladimir.
- Kahl, Thede and Michael Metzeltin. 2015. Die Numerusbildung in den Balkansprachen. Ein typologischer Vergleich. *Slavia Meridionalis* 15, 75–98.
- Kiparsky, Valentin. 1967. *Russische historische Grammatik. Band II. Die Entwicklung des Formensystems*. Heidelberg.
- Koneski, B. 1982. *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturnen jazik*. Skopje.
- Mel'čuk, Igor' A. 1985. *Poverxnostnyj sintaksis russkix čislovyx vyraženiij*. Wien.

- Mulisch, Herbert et al. 1988. *Russische Sprache der Gegenwart. Band 2*. Leipzig.
- Piper, Predrag. 2005. Kvantifikacija. In: Milka Ivić (ed.), *Sintaksa savremenoga srpskog jezika. Prosta rečenica*. Beograd, 870–914.
- Raguž, Dragutin. 1997. *Praktična hrvatska gramatika*. Zagreb.
- Rusanovski, V. M. 1986. *Ukrainskaja grammatika*. Kiev: Naukova Dumka.
- Scholze, Lenka. 2008. *Das grammatische System der obersorbischen Umgangssprache im Sprachkontakt*. Bautzen.
- Schubert, Ludmila. 2008. *Ukrainisch für Anfänger und Fortgeschrittene. 2., überarbeitete Auflage*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Suprun, A. E. 1969. *Slavjanskije čislitel'nye. Stanovlenie čislitel'nyx kak osoboj časti reči*. Minsk.
- Šaxmatov, A. A. 1957. *Istoričeskaja morfologija ruskogo jazyka*. Moskva.
- Švedova, N. Ju. et al. 1980. *Russkaja grammatika. Tom I*. Moskva.
- Troškina, Tat'jana P. 2001. *Die ukrainische Sprache – Ukrainiskij jazyk*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Unbegaun, Boris. 1935. *La langue russe au XVI^e siècle (1500-1550). I. La flexion des noms*. Paris.
- Vinogradov, V. V. 1972. *Ruskij jazyk (grammatičeskoe učenie o slove)*. Moskva.
- Zaloznjak, A. A. 2002. *Russkoe imennoe slovoizmenenie*. Moskva.
- Znika, Marija. 2002. *Kategorija brojivosti u hrvatskom jeziku*. Zagreb.
- Žolobov, O. F. and V. B. Krys'ko. 2001. *Istoričeskaja grammatika drevneruskogo jazyka. Dvojstvennoe čislo*. Moskva.