

**Bartosz JUSZCZAK (Wrocław)**  
University of Wrocław  
bartosz.juszczak@uwr.edu.pl  
ORCID broj: 0000-0002-7058-0384

## **ANALYTIC AND SYNTHETIC CONSTRUCTIONS IN SLAVIC LANGUAGES: POLISH, CZECH, RUSSIAN**

In this article the author refers to the problem of analytic and synthetic constructions in modern Slavic languages: Polish, Czech, Russian. The author makes a critical review of rich subject literature and carries out a comparison of the scope of the definition and functions of the issue in question. The material basis includes textual corpus data (parallel text corpus) of three types of analytical construction in the researched languages. The preliminary analysis shows that the severity of grammatical marker is different in the analyzed languages and depends on many external and internal factors. Based on the results of this critical review and analysis, it can be concluded that there is a research gap that gives the opportunity for the further studies.

*Key words: Slavic languages, non-inflection, analytical constructions, lexical analytisms*

### **1. Introduction**

Non-static character of Slavic languages, their openness in the scope of subbranches and various types of influences – of both internal and external nature – undoubtedly affect the development of new grammatical tendencies which were first noticed as far back as the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Additionally, these processes should be associated with the changes which do not have any direct character (linguistic). What I mean here is the impact of historical, political, and, above all, global factors and aspects. The aforementioned factors have an indirect influence on the changes to the extent of expressing grammatical changes and creating new functional-semantic and formal-grammar units. Thus, it can be surmised that this phenomenon partially contributes to the creation of new linguistic types and increasingly dynamic transition of Slavic languages from inflected languages to directly

analytical<sup>1</sup>. Some contemporary researchers confirm through their research that analytical processes in languages are becoming more common and that they are transferred into other areas of language, for instance to parts of speech which have not been analytical before (Dedkovska, 2011: 202).

## 2. Objectives of the article

The aims of this article are:

1. To review and analyse previous research on analytic and synthetic constructions in both the Western and Eastern branches of the Slavic languages, with particular reference to Polish, Czech, and Russian.
2. To present different approaches to the interpretation of these constructions across language groups. It is worth noting at this point that in the Germanic languages this phenomenon is associated in particular with the loss of inflectional morphology.

The main aim of the article is to address the question of whether corpus data can provide insights and methodological opportunities for linguistic research into similarities and differences in analytic constructions in the languages under discussion, with particular emphasis on legal language.

The final task will be to discuss the methods used and answer the question whether it is possible to use parallel corpora in the study of analytical constructs in the languages under discussion?

It will be the starting point for further research in this area.

## 3. Status of research and some types of analytical constructions in Slavic languages

The roots of the contemporary linguistic typology can be found in the works of Wilhelm von Humboldt who left behind a considerable legacy of generalizations in this matter which enables to differentiate the particular linguistic types (Humboldt, 2001). However, what is currently known as the proper typological research starts in the 20th century. This fact can be proven not only by a significant number of various articles and monographs from that period (more about them later), but also by the words of Tadeusz Milewski. In 1963 he showed that (at the time) there were no clearly stated and established contrastive methods in the linguistic typology. What is also of importance is the fact that he made an effort to establish the proper research methodology (Milewski, 1963: 4).

---

<sup>1</sup> Kazimierz Polański is one of the researchers that mentions the beginnings of analytical tendencies even in proto-Slavic language (Polański, 1993: 42–43).

In both Polish and Russian, analitism – as opposed to synthetism – has repeatedly been examined in terms of both the description of the language and works which were to a greater or lesser extent contrastive. In Polish, thorough research on analitism can be found, for example, in Danuta Buttler’s articles, which are incorporated in the cycle entitled *Semantyka a składnia w związkach wyrazowych*<sup>2</sup> [Semantics and Syntax in the combinations of words]. The author says that the process of the transition of the Polish language into the analytical type, which at the same time expands the number of such constructions, is caused by the need for filling certain gaps in conjugative paradigms, enhance semantic clarity, perceive the unambiguity of descriptive forms – contrary to inflectional forms which tend to acquire a secondary function (Buttler, 1968: 349–350). Yet another example of the crucial research is Janusz Anusiewicz’s monograph in which the author analyzes the descriptive structures on lexical, morphological and syntactic levels. Similarly to Danuta Buttler, to Anusiewicz’s mind the expansion of such structures is conditioned by certain factors: communicative (avoiding any possible misunderstandings between interlocutors), attempting to reach the semantic precision and clarity, stylistic and non-linguistics factors.

The history of the research on analitism in the Russian language is also long – it dates back to 1870s and is closely connected to the works of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay. The interest in this issue can be proven by newer and newer articles and monographs which focus on various levels of this topic (Timur Radbil’ is one of the researchers writing about this phenomenon spreading in the Russian language (Radbil’, 2020: 8–10)). What is worth highlighting is the fact that analitism in contemporary Russian can be realized in constructions similar to those in Polish and Czech. Examples of such a phenomenon can be, for instance, the growing number of uninflected nouns and adjectives, the appearance and constant functioning of abbreviations or the analytical expression of grammatical category in the case of neutral nouns. (Dedkowska, 2011: 202). Jelena Marinova is yet another researcher that pays attention to the existence of a high number of uninflected nouns in contemporary Russian, both proper and common. What the researcher shows – which is significant from the point of view of grammar and semantics – is the diffusional semantic nature of foreign neologisms, which frequently causes the used expression to be inaccurate. It may stem from, for instance, the fact that the new analytical forms have not settled in the language yet. As Marinova says, an example of such a unit are: „в режиме онлайн, в режиме офлайн“ in which „the lexical meaning is defined by an attributive construction in which the neologism in

<sup>2</sup> See also (Due to space limits, I do not provide all works that constitute this cycle): (Buttler 1966a, 1966b, 1967).

a form of a modifier refers to a noun having a deeper meaning“ (Marinova, 2019: 191, 195). What can be surmised is that analytical structures seem to be essential or almost essential and enable the proper understanding of a neologism which should be interpreted as specifying the semantic meaning.

What should be noted, however, is the growing interest in this topic among contemporary Czech and Polish Russian linguists. Zdeňka Nedomová created a list of Russian uninflected nouns borrowed from other languages (borrowings). In order to do that she extracted these words from several dictionaries of foreign words and Russian press (Nedomova, 2013: 35). It is also worth mentioning that according to Halina Mieczkowska inflectionlessness is one of the most clear examples of analitism. She concludes that this phenomenon is becoming not only more common, but also more complex (Mieczkowska, 2010: 229–131). Another example of the contemporary study of analitism is the monograph by Lukáša Plesnik who conducted the contrastive analysis of such analytic adjectives in Polish, Czech and Russian as, for instance, евродепутат [a Member of European Parliament], cyklostezka [bicycle path], interkomunikacja [intercommunication] (Plesnik, 2019). Finally, some contrastive Polish-Russian studies by Wojciech Sosnowski ought to be pointed out (Sosnowski, 2011). The research on miscellaneous types of analitism in the Czech languages is also quite a common paradigm conducted in contemporary linguistics (Radimský, 2010).

In contemporary linguistic research, the greatest emphasis has been placed on the analysis of verbo-nominal constructions and lexical analytisms, which also constitute an example of analytic constructions (Baer, 2021; Burska, 2016).

In order to outline further research perspectives, it seems reasonable not only to define what the phenomenon of interest actually is, but also point out any possible discrepancy in the scope and the definitions in the languages which are discussed in this article. *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego* [The Encyclopedia of General Linguistics] defines it in a following way:

A morphological and syntactic phenomenon observed in the development of inflectional languages. It consists in grammatical categories (cases, tense, moods, etc.) which were at first expressed via flectional forms (suffixes) beginning to be expressed via separate exponents in a form of separate words, for instance, verbs, pronouns, prepositions. Such words are referred to as „auxiliary“ due to the fact that they lose their initial lexical value (at least in some usages), and take up a grammatical function. (Polański, 1993: 42–43)

The Russian encyclopedia of language, *Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь*, provides a similar definition:

A typological quality, frequently opposed to synthetism, which is expressed by a separate phrase of the basic word (lexical) and an additional (grammatical, derivational) meaning of a word. Analytism is characterized by inflectional words and the presence of analytical (complex) constructions (forms). In the case of uninflected words, the grammatical meanings can be expressed via words next to auxiliary words and full-meaning words, sentence order, intonation. In the verbs „хожу“ [I am walking], „ходишь“ [you are walking], „ходит“ [he/she/it is walking] the category of the person is expressed synthetically, but in „я, ты, он ходил“ [I/he was/ you were walking] analytically. Morphological inflectionlessness is typical for Isolating languages. The degree of analytism is determined by the number of morphemes in the average word (for example, in English it is 1,78, in Russian about 2,4, in Sanskrit about 2,6). (Gak, 2002: 31)

The definition is not provided by Czech encyclopedias. It can, however, be found in a Slovak encyclopedia of linguistics: „A phenomenon in which the grammatical meanings are expressed via auxiliary words, as opposed to synthetism, in which the grammatical meaning is expressed within a word via prefixes, infixes, suffixes or via inside flexion without any auxiliary words“ (Nedomová, 2013: 35).

What can be concluded is that analytism in the languages is perceived similarly. In the present article, however, the focus is not on exclusively grammatical aspects, but rather on the grammatical-lexical domain. What is also worth noticing is that all the presented definitions concentrate on the formal-grammar side of the language, although the Russian definition also points out that analytism refers to the way the lexical meaning is expressed. What is of utmost importance and interest for me is the combination of words which contribute to the reconstruction of the essence of simple units. In my research, following Anusiewicz, I will perceive *analytical construction* as „combination of inseparable words which co-exist along with their semantically equivalent single words“ (Anusiewicz, 1978: 22), e.g. „złamać nogę“ [to break a leg] and „doznać złamania nogi“ [sustain a broken leg]. Due to a wide scope of the issue of interest, in the initial stage of my research I would like to focus only on the chosen constructions with high frequency language corpora (in subject literature also called *multiverbisms* – a combination of two or more verbs). I distinguish the following types:

a) **analytical constructions noun + noun**, for example *fakt sprzedania* [the **fact** of **sale**] in which the superior noun (*fakt*) expresses a rather general meaning, and the subordinate noun (*sprzedania*) bears the lexical meaning;

**b) analytical connection of phase verbs with an infinitive or with a noun** (gerund), for example *czynność mówienia* [the act of speaking] in which the phase verb defines the phase of a process (*czynność*) and the additional component determines the proper action (*mówienie*);

**c) analytical adverbial construction**, for example *w sposób tradycyjny* [in a traditional way] vs. *tradycyjnie* [traditionally].

Perhaps the further analysis of this phenomenon as well linguistic material which would be completely different from the hitherto existing, will allow to differentiate other subtypes of analytical construction<sup>3</sup> on this level.<sup>4</sup>

### Method and material

The research that has so far been conducted on the three languages of interest, was, as I was trying to show earlier, carried out on the basis of varied research material – dictionaries, press, various texts. The confrontation in mind will be based on the text corpus. Corpora are able to provide undoubtedly the biggest and most varied empirical material – especially nowadays with texts taken from plethora of sources. It can be proven by the quantitative data gathered by Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego (NKJP) – about 150 million words, Český Národní Korpus (ČNK SYN) – about 4,9 billion words, Национальный корпус русского языка (RUSCORPORA) – about 1.5 billion words. However, as far as the comparison is concerned, the most invaluable source of material is the InterCorp corpus which is an example of a referential parallel (42 languages) corpus that is being constantly updated.

In order to justify the contrastive research on the Slavic languages in terms of the aforementioned analytical categories, a preliminary corpus verification and the analysis of the gathered material have been conducted. In this initial analysis, the lexeme *sposób* [way] and the verb *zacząć* [to start] are going to be of the utmost importance, and the Polish language (*tertium comparationis*) is the one that is going to be confronted with the remaining two. It means that all the Polish constructions will be analytical in nature. In the parallel corpus InterCorp, v14 finds the word *sposób* 5907 times, the word *zacząć*, on the other hand, appears 662 times. It has to be said that due to quantitative restrictions I will present explicit, unambiguous constructions.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> In the relevant literature, these constructions are also frequently referred to as lexical analytisms. (Burska, 2016).

<sup>4</sup> Such relationships/connection/units are differentiated by Janusz Anusiewicz. He points out that noun + adjective are rather sparse in the material he had gathered, but they really are prominent. (Anusiewicz, 1978).

<sup>5</sup> While presenting the material and constructions, I use the following abbreviations: A – analytical construction; S – synthetic construction; Sub – noun; Adj – adjective; Adv – adverb;

It is also worth noting that the analysis is based on parallel corpus data, hence it has to be borne in mind that the semantics of the excerpted sentences may be expressed equally depending on the context and the type of the confronted texts. However, in my analysis I omit the lexical meaning of the gathered construction and focus on the strictly formal side.

Below, sample searches for types of analytic constructions will be presented. From the perspective of corpus-based research, a parallel corpus is not an ideal tool for this type of investigation for at least two key reasons: (1) quantitative and statistical analysis is practically infeasible due to the complexity of such combinations and, moreover, as can be observed, the occurrence of the constructions of interest in different relations and positions, which means that the verification of units would have to be carried out manually; (2) it does not seem possible to construct a corpus query that would allow one to retrieve a given type of construction even within a single language.

Analytical constructions in Polish noun + noun:

POLISH	CZECH	RUSSIAN	DESCRIPTION
<b>Sposób funkcjonowania</b> owej maszyny był bardzo interesujący.	Automat <b>fungoval</b> velmi zajímavě. <b>V</b>	Этот автомат <b>работал</b> очень интересным образом. <b>V</b>	A – S – S
– Chwilami trudno mi zrozumieć twój <b>sposób wyrażania się</b> .	Víš , pozemšťane , někdy je dost obtížné pochopit tvůj <b>způsob vyjadřování</b> .	– Землянин, - сказал он, – мне иногда трудно понять твою <b>речь</b> . <b>Sub</b>	A – A – S
Wszystkie Jej zalecenia, sam <b>sposób rozmawiania</b> wpajały pacjentowi spokój i pewność, pomagały walczyć z chorobą.	Všechny její pokyny a sám <b>způsob jednání</b> působil na pacienta uklidňujícím dojmem , dával mu jistotu a pomáhal mu překonat chorobu.	Все ее назначения, сама <b>манера разговаривать</b> внушали пациенту спокойствие и уверенность, помогли ему сопротивляться болезни. <b>Sub + Vinf</b>	A – A – A

V – verb; Vinf – infinitive. The empirical material has been entirely taken from the Inter-Corp corpus.

Po drugie, gdyż ten <b>sposób przedstawiania</b> bardziej pasuje do wiedzy, jaką mamy na tej ziemi o Bogu.	Za druhé je tento <b>způsob zobrazení</b> vhodnější pro naše poznání Boha	Во-вторых, это ближе к тому <b>представлению</b> о Всевышнем, кое бытует здесь на земле. <b>Sub</b>	A – A – S
Sam powiadasz, że znalazła <b>sposób mówienia</b> do ciebie całkiem innym językiem niż dotychczas.	Sám říkáš, že s tebou dokázala <b>jednat</b> a hovořit docela jinak než dříve. <b>V</b>	Сам ты говоришь, что нашла же она <b>возможность говорить</b> с тобой совсем другим языком, чем прежде обращалась и говорила. <b>Sub + Vinf</b>	A – S – A

As can be concluded from table 1., the analytical constructions **Sub + Sub** in the Polish language differ in Czech and Russian. In the Czech language there exist analytical forms as well as a synthetic form expressed solely by **V**. It differs considerably in Russian as the synthetic forms are realized by both **V** and **Sub**, analytical forms, on the other hand, are created by constructions **Sub + Vinf**, which is typical of the Russian language. On the basis of the preliminary analysis, the general regularity of the phenomenon in these languages cannot be determined.

1. Analytical verb phrases – verb (infinitive) – *zacząć* + infinitive or gerund

POLISH	CZECH	RUSSIAN	DESCRIPTION
zacząć dowiadywać się	dozvědět se <b>V</b>	начинать знакомиться <b>V</b> + <b>V</b>	A – S – A
zacząć nowe życie	začít nový život <b>V+Adj+Sub</b>	начать новую жизнь <b>V+Adj+Sub</b>	A – A – A
zacząć działać	jednat <b>V</b>	действовать <b>V</b>	A – S – S
zacząć się ukrywać	odejít <b>V</b>	скрыться <b>V</b>	A – S – S
zacząć uczyć się	učít se <b>V</b>	стали учиться <b>V+V</b>	A – S – A
zacząć walczyć	bojovat <b>V</b>	драться <b>V</b>	A – S – S

The Polish analytical construction is expressed in a similar, rather irregular way. While the Czech language makes use of, in most cases, a synthetic form – infinitive, in the Russian language the units of a phase verb + infinitive are more frequently utilized.

2. Analytical adverbial constructions – prepositional phrases *w sposób* + adjective (in the Polish language):

POLISH	CZECH	RUSSIAN	DESCRIPTION
w sposób prosty	prostě <b>Adv</b>	простосердечно <b>Adv</b>	A – S – S
w sposób bezceremonialny	bezostyšně <b>Adv</b>	бесцеремонным образом <b>Adj+Sub</b>	A – S – A
w sposób ordynarny	hrubě <b>Adj</b>	грубо <b>Adv</b>	A – S – S
w sposób ogólńikowy	všeobecně <b>Adv</b>	неопределенно <b>Adv</b>	A – S – S
w sposób naturalny	přirozeně <b>Adv</b>	естественно <b>Adv</b>	A – S – S
w sposób osobliwy	zvláštně <b>Adv</b>	особенным образом <b>Adj+Sub</b>	A – S – A
w sposób nowy i zaskakujący	způsobem novým a nezvyklým <b>Sub+Adj+Adj</b>	новым, удивительным образом <b>Adj+Adj+Sub</b>	A – A – A

From the fragment of the corpus analysis presented above, it can be concluded that in most cases it is the Czech language that uses synthetic forms to get across prepositional phrases. In Russian, on the other hand, constructions **Adj + Sub** seem to be more frequent. From a syntactic point of view, it functions as an adverbial clause.

Certain, rather general, conclusions can be formulated on the basis on the analyzed fragment of the linguistic material. The initial analysis shows that the lexical meaning of the particular units can be expressed in various ways depending on the chosen language, which is justified by formal-grammatical means of expression typical for the language. It cannot be explicitly defined which constructions of the languages in interest are more frequent in analytical and/or synthetic forms.

What can also be assumed is that the presence of this phenomenon in the Slavic languages –typologically flecional – does not determine any different typological belonging, but rather concentrates on the way of expressing the lexical-grammatical meaning. The assumption can be proven on the basis of the analysis and its results which were presented above.

A drawback of the Czech corpus is that the units it contains originate exclusively from literary texts and subtitles. It lacks material derived from legal and administrative texts.

## Conclusions

To conclude, it seems significant to consider the general regularity of such state of affairs. Hence, further research in the matter will, in my opinion, allow to answer the following questions:

- Is the usage of a construction accidental? If not, why is it used? Do we come across the intention to specify – more semantic clarity, at least in the case of noun connection or modality/ the phase of the process in verb constructions?
- Are the redundant synthetic forms displacing the typologically belonging synthetic forms even though languages and communication *a priori* aim to be economical? What is the scope of this phenomenon?
- What are the proportions and structures of the synthetic and analytical forms in the confronted languages?
- It seems reasonable to fill the research gap in the scope of Slavic linguistics, especially in the confrontative analysis of the phenomenon. Defining the ratio of analytical and synthetic indices will allow to show not only the direction in which the progress of this phenomenon seems to be going in Slavic languages, but also its intensification degree. To my mind, the description of this phenomenon will not only take the form of the basic research, but may also be applied in contemporary linguistic technologies, translation studies and foreign languages teaching. It may also be relevant in terms of LLM development and research.

## Bibliography:

- Anusiewicz, J. (1978). *Konstrukcje analityczne we współczesnym języku polskim*. Wrocław.
- Baer, M. (2021). „Kolokacje werbo-nominalne a czasowniki syntetyczne w języku polskim i chorwackim“. *Humanities and Cultural Studies*, vol. 2, br. 2, str. 12–24.
- Burska, K. (2016). *Analityzmy leksykalne i ich semantyczne odpowiedniki*. Łódź.
- Buttler, D. (1966a). „Semantyka a składnia w związkach wyrazowych“. *Poradnik Językowy*, 7, str. 233–243.
- Buttler, D. (1966b). „Semantyka a składnia w związkach wyrazowych II. Słowotwórczo-semantyczne przyczyny zmiany reakcji wyrazów“. *Poradnik Językowy*, 6, str. 281–293.
- Buttler, D. (1967). „Semantyka a składnia w związkach wyrazowych V. Ekspansja konstrukcji analitycznych“. *Poradnik Językowy*, 1, str. 6–18.

- Buttler, D. (1968). „Połączenia typu *ulec zniszczeniu*“. *Poradnik Językowy*, 7, str. 349–359.
- Dedkovskaya, D. M. (2011). „K voprosu o proyavleniyakh analitizma v sovremennom russkom yazyke“. *Vestnik IrGTU*, 7 (54), str. 201–206.
- Gak, V. G. (2002). „Analitizm“, u: Yartseva, V. N. (ur.) *Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar'*. Moskva, str. 31.
- Humboldt, W. (2001). *Rozmaitość języków a rozwój umysłowy ludzkości*. Tłum. L. Kowalska. Lublin.
- Marinova, E. (2018). „Otsutstviye slovoizmeneniya u naritsatel'nykh sushchestvitel'nykh na soglasnyy: granitsy yavleniya v sovremennoy russkoy rechi“. *Przeгляд Wschodnioeuropejski*, IX/2, str. 191–199.
- Mieczkowska, H. (2010). „Globalizacja a fleksyjny charakter języka (w ujęciu polsko-słowackim)“, u: Kurek, H. & Gruchała, J. (ur.) *Silva rerum philologicarum. Studia ofiarowane Profesor Marii Strycharskiej-Brzezynie z okazji Jej jubileuszu*. Kraków, str. 223–231.
- Milewski, T. (1963). „Predposylki tipologicheskogo yazykoznaniya“, u: Moloshnaya, T. N. (ur.) *Issledovaniya po strukturnoy tipologii*. Moskva, str. 3–31.
- Nedomová, Z. (2013). *Tendence k analytismu v současné ruštině (na materiálu jmenných slovních druhů)*. Ostrava.
- Plesník, L. (2019). *Typologická charakteristika tzv. analytických adjektiv (na příkladovém materiálu ruštiny, češtiny a polštiny)*. Ostrava.
- Polański, K. (1993). „Analityczna tendencja w języku“, u: Polański, K. (ur.) *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego*. Wrocław, str. 42–43.
- Radbil', T. (2020). „Analitizm vs sintetizm v aktivnykh protsessakh v grammatike sovremennogo russkogo yazyka“. *Mir russkogo slova*, br. 1, str. 7–12.
- Radimský, J. (2010). *Verbo-nominální predikát s kategoriálním slovesem*. České Budějovice.
- Sosnowski, W. (2011). „Analytic Tendencies in Modern Polish and Russian“. *Cognitive Studies | Études Cognitives*, str. 97–108.

### Corpus sources:

- Pęzik, P. (2012). „Wyszukiwarka PELCRA dla danych NKJP“, u: Przepiórkowski, A., Bańko, M., Górski, R. & Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (ur.) *Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego*. Dostępno na: [http://www.nkjp.uni.lodz.pl/index\\_adv.jsp](http://www.nkjp.uni.lodz.pl/index_adv.jsp) [Pristupljeno: 15. 1. 2026].
- Český národní korpus – InterCorp. Dostępno na: <https://www.korpus.cz/intercorp> [Pristupljeno: 10. 12. 2025].
- Nacional'nyj korpus ruskogo jazyka. Dostępno na: <http://www.ruscorp-ora.ru/> [Pristupljeno: 18. 11. 2025].

### Bartosz JUSZCZAK

#### ANALITIČKE I SINTETIČKE KONSTRUKCIJE U SLOVENSKIM JEZICIMA: POLJSKI, ČEŠKI, RUSKI

U ovom radu autor se bavi problemom analitičkih i sintetičkih konstrukcija u savremenim slovenskim jezicima: poljskom, češkom i ruskom. Autor daje kritički pregled bogate naučne literature o ovoj temi i vrši poređenje obima definicije i funkcija razmatranog fenomena. Materijalnu osnovu čine podaci iz tekstualnih korpusa (paralelni tekstualni korpus) koji obuhvataju tri tipa analitičkih konstrukcija u istraživanim jezicima. Preliminarna analiza pokazuje da se izraženost gramatičkog markera razlikuje u analiziranim jezicima i zavisi od brojnih spoljašnjih i unutrašnjih faktora. Na osnovu rezultata ovog kritičkog pregleda i analize može se zaključiti da postoji istraživačka praznina koja otvara prostor za dalja istraživanja.

Ključne riječi: *slovenski jezici, nefleksija, analitičke konstrukcije, leksički analizmi*