

## Layering in the system of Middle Russian periphrastic future constructions through a corpus perspective

Mittwoch,  
04.03.2020  
16:30–17:00  
ESA1 O 122

Yana Penkova

V.V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences

penkovajanine@gmail.com

According to the well-known cross-linguistic studies conducted by Joan Bybee and Östen Dahl (Bybee & Dahl 1989, Bybee et al. 1991, Dahl 2000), there are multiple sources for the development of future tense marking. It can lead to the emergence of new layers (Hopper 1991), that is a coexistence of different „futures“ in a language and competition between them. Middle Russian represents a remarkably rich system of different periphrastic futures, and within this system, there was a notably rich subsystem of periphrastic futures with auxiliaries from inchoative verbs, viz. *imu* ‘take>begin’, *počnu* ‘begin1’, *načnu* ‘begin2’, *učnu* ‘begin3’, *stanu* ‘rise>become’. These periphrases were claiming the role of imperfective future form since they could co-occur only with infinitives of the imperfective aspect. Alongside with „inchoative futures“, the constructions with the auxiliaries *xoču* ‘want’, *imam* ‘have’ and *budu* ‘be.FUT’ also existed in the Middle Russian writing. The former two – aspectually indifferent – were attested already in the most archaic texts, and were still active until the end of the Middle Russian period occupying a special aspectual and modal place within a system. “*budu* + INF” was purely imperfective and gained in frequency only at the end of the Middle Russian times.

AG 7

The emergence of inchoative futures in Middle Russian and their distribution create a problem for the claim introduced by Ö. Dahl (2000) that „some contexts are typically quite late in being reached by an expanding future gram“, namely temporal and conditional clauses, what is explained by their non-assertiveness. That is not the case for some Middle Russian periphrastic futures with inchoative auxiliaries, which emerge in *conditional clauses*:

- (1) **Ašče** [COND] *kto imet* [take-AUX.PRS.3SG] *dvě ženy voditi* [have-INF], mitropolitu 20 given.
- (2) **Ašče** [COND] *li otydemü ot velikogo kn’az’a v Litvu ili v nemcy ili o sebě učnemü* [begin-AUX.PRS.1PL] **žiti** [live-INF] *bez gosudar’a, ino na nas gněvü božij.*

The paper examines the interaction and competition between different Middle Russian periphrastic futures with particular focus on inchoative ones using the data from Russian National Corpus, namely Middle Russian subcorpus. It allows outlining the place and function of each construction in the network, distinguishing between futures with the higher and lower assertion and contributing to our understanding of diachronic development of such systems.

**References:** Bybee, J. L. & Ö. Dahl (1989). The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. *Studies in Language* 13, 51–103. Bybee, J. L., W. Pagliuca & R. D. Perkins (1991). Back to the future. In Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Heine, Bernd (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, vol. II (Focus on Types of Grammatical Markers), Amsterdam: Benjamins, 17–58. Dahl, Ö (2000). The grammar of future time reference in European languages. In Dahl, Östen (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 309–328. Hopper, P. J. (1991) On some principles of grammaticization. In: *Approaches to grammaticalization*, Vol. 1. Elisabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds), Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 17–36.