

Crosslinguistic patterns of interaction between modal and aspectual properties in futures

Joanna Błaszczak

University of Wrocław

joanna.blaszczak@uwr.edu.pl

Mittwoch,
04.03.2020
13:45–14:45
ESA1 O 122

There is good crosslinguistic evidence for assuming that future markers consist of two meaning components: modality and prospective time shifting. The goal of the talk is to identify recurrent patterns of interaction between these two factors and to establish correlations with different kinds of modality and aspectuality in order to account for the typological variation. It will be shown that languages differ considerably along the following dimensions: **(i) the type of lexicalization/morphological realization of these two meaning components of future markers, (ii) the kind of modality involved, and (iii) the obligatoriness of prospective time shifting.**

Ad. (i) Four different cases can be distinguished: 1) modality and prospective time shifting are conjointly encoded in one morpheme (e.g., in St'át'imcets; Matthewson 2006); 2) modality and prospective time shifting are expressed by two separate, overtly realized morphemes (e.g., in Hausa; Mucha & Zimmermann 2016); 3) one meaning (modality) is realized overtly, the other meaning component (prospective time shifting) is covert (e.g., in Medumba; Mucha 2015); 4) one meaning (prospective time shifting) is realized overtly, the other meaning component (modality) is covert (e.g., in Gitksan; Matthewson 2013). **Ad. (ii)** The observed differences between languages concern the modal base and ordering source, on the one hand, and the quantificational force, on the other. For instance, while the future markers in Greek, Italian, Hausa, Medumba, and Guarani involve universal quantification over possible worlds, the St'át'imcets future marker *kelh* is taken to be a circumstantial modal which is compatible with both universal and existential quantificational force. Variable quantificational force in the sense of gradable modality (degree modals) has been assumed for Slovenian and Bulgarian (Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2016). **Ad. (ii)** The following cases can be distinguished: (1) Prospective time shifting is obligatory. – In this case future markers obligatorily convey future time reference and do not allow for present- (or past-) oriented epistemic readings (e.g., the St'át'imcets future marker *kelh*); (2) Prospective time shifting is not obligatory. Two options can be distinguished here: (2-a) No future shifter is present. As a consequence, no future-oriented readings are possible, only present- or past-oriented epistemic readings (cf. the Greek future marker *tha*); (2-b) A future shifter (prospective aspect) is present but it can co-occur with imperfective aspect. In this case both ordinary future readings and present-oriented epistemic readings are available (e.g., the Medumba future marker *á'*); the prerequisite for the latter option is that aspect stacking is allowed in a given language (Mucha 2015).

References: Błaszczak, J. (2019). "Be future" – Old and modern views on FUTURE: Typological, diachronic and psycholinguistic aspects. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University Press. Giannakidou, A. & A. Mari (2018). A unified analysis of the future as epistemic modality: The view from Greek and Italian. *NLLT* 36(1), 85–129. Matthewson, L. (2006). Temporal semantics in a supposedly tenseless language. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 29, 673–713. Matthewson, L. (2013). Gitksan modals. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 79, 349–394. Mucha, A. (2015). Temporal interpretation and cross-linguistic variation. A formal semantic analysis of temporal and aspectual reference in Hausa and Medumba. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Potsdam. Mucha, A. & M. Zimmermann (2016). TAM-coding and temporal interpretation in West African languages. In Błaszczak, J., et al. (eds.) *Mood, aspect, modality revisited. New answers to old questions*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 6–44. Rivero, M. L. & M. Milojević Sheppard (2016). The Slovenian future auxiliary *biti* as a tenseless gradable evidential modal. Inferential and concessive readings. In: Marušič, F. & R. Žaucer (eds.) *Formal studies in Slovenian syntax*. In honor of Janek Orešnik. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 253–281.

AG 7