Finding a home for movement futures between modality and aspect

Uta Reinöhl

University of Mainz

uta.reinoehl@uni-mainz.de

Movement futures are typically listed as a separate, major type of future constructions besides ones arising from modal sources or from aspectual ones (typically, "old presents"). For instance, *go*-futures are considered a type deserving its own analysis in the well-known study of Fleischman (1982) or in the work by Joan Bybee and her colleagues (e.g., Bybee & Pagliuca 1987, Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1991, Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994). In this talk, I argue that at least some movement futures can be classified with futures arising from either modal or aspectual sources, and that they need not form a category of their own.

In this talk, I present detailed analyses of two *go*-future constructions, one of them I argue should be classified with modal futures, and the other with aspectual futures. The former is the intensively studied future *be going to* in English, while the latter is the lesser studied synthetic future of Hindi/Urdu. It seems clear that constructions involving a lexeme *go* are particularly prone to grammaticalizing into futures. However, the crucial semantic components that form the stepping stones for the grammaticalization processes in these two cases are, on the one hand, a modal component, and an aspectual component, on the other hand. For this reason, a more economic and elegant analysis of the future domain assigns *go*-futures to either of those semantic realms, rather than setting up a third category.

This analysis lends support to the view that – in assessing grammaticalization pathways – it is essential to take the meaning of the constructional whole into account following, e.g., Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca (1994) and Eckardt (2006). Analyses that narrowly focus on the grammaticalizing morpheme ("gram") only fall short of yielding satisfactory insights into motivations for the pathways of change that are observable. Even though this constructional view has for some time been widely adopted by grammaticalization researchers, it survives in the tradition of considering *go*-futures a group of their own, simply because they all involve a gram of that meaning. I argue in this talk that not all *go*-futures are equal as they grammaticalize in semantically distinct constructional frames, which determine different pathways of change. In my analysis, I will build in particular on the detailed analysis of the grammaticalization of *be going to* as presented in Eckardt (2006), while offering a slightly modified analysis, as well as on historical evidence of the Hindi/Urdu future.

References: Eckardt, Regine (2006). Meaning change in grammaticalization: An enquiry into semantic reanalysis. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Fleischman, Suzanne (1982). The future in thought and language: Diachronic evidence from Romance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Bybee, Joan & William Pagliuca (1987). The evolution of future meaning. Papers from the 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, ed. by Anna Giacalone Ramat, Onofrio Carruba, and Giuliano Bernini, 109–122. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Bybee, Joan; Pagliuca, William & Revere Perkins (1991). Back to the future. Approaches to grammaticalization, vol. 2: Types of grammatical markers, ed. by Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, 17–58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Bybee, Joan; Perkins, Revere & William Pagliuca (1994). The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

AG 7