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Bernard Comrie (1976):

• “The perfect is retrospective, in that it establishes a relation between a state at one time and a situation at an earlier time. If languages were completely symmetrical, one might equally well expect to find prospective forms, where a state is related to some subsequent situation, for instance where someone is in a state of being about to do something.
Comrie

• Distinguishes two types of prospectives in English
• Opposes prospective to future semantics
• Opposes prospective and intentional semantics
• Proposes combinability with inanimate subjects as a test for distinguishing prospectivity
• Stresses the combinability of prospective forms with TAM markers
(i.e. it is not a TAM marker)
Proposes to distinguish prospective and proximative; the first being an aspect marker, and the second an actionality marker. In his view,

• “Prospective (← Latin *prospicere* ‘to look forward’) is a perspective on events foreseen to occur subsequent to some temporal orientation point (‘reference time’).

• Prospective items mostly have a more or less strong modal component. Volition, intention, probability, etc. are modal notions directed towards a relative future. Future reference is largely a matter of modality. “

• The primary orientation point is the moment of encoding. “Prospectives-in-present” convey a preview in a non-past perspective, implying that an event is foreseen to occur after the primary orientation point. The items get readings such as ‘shall, will occur, is going to occur, is supposed, expected, or requested to occur’, e.g. Turkish *Gid-ecek* ‘X will go’.

• *Proximatives* refer to a pre-phase, a phase preliminary or preparatory to a possible subsequent event, conceived of as imminent, impending, i.e. as being “about to occur”. The situation obtaining at the orientation point coincides with this pre-phase.
Östen Dahl (1985):

• “A formally and semantically analogous construction to the English one is found in some Romance languages, e.g. the French *aller* + infinitive, and in Afrikaans *gaan* + infinitive. In all those, verbs meaning ‘to go’ are employed.”
• “There is thus evidence for postulating a cross-linguistic category Prospective. All the assumed examples of Prospective are periphrastic. It should be noted that in some languages (e.g. Maori and Oromo), a Progressive category may be used for Prospective, as it is also possible in similar cases in English.”
Further research on prospective / imminent future / proximative forms

• Joan Bybee (1994: 271-273) discovered 26 future grams (grammatical morphemes) that have immediate future of some kind as its use; in 19 of the cases, it is their sole function. Immediate future is also the sole future reading of two imperfectives and two perfectives.
The sources of immediate futures:

- forms of desire and obligation
- the verb “to come”
- temporal adverbs
• ”: “The prototypical glosses for such grams are ‘be about to do something’ and ‘be on the point of doing something’. Although this is obviously very much like the notion ‘entering on a path to do something’ (especially, of course, in the case of such grams descending from ‘come’), it is in a sense also not at all like a prediction.
If immediate futures cannot be said to involve prediction, they may be regarded in either of two ways: as necessarily young future somewhere between proto-futures and a mature future with prediction as its core function; or if not young, but rather established and stable, not strictly speaking futures at all, at least not in epistemic terms, amounting more to assertions announcing the imminence of an event rather than a prediction that it will take place.”
• Fleischman (1983) states that immediate futures can be generalized to a general future
• Heine - “almost-aspect”
• König - “proximative“
• Tania Kuteva – proximative versus avertive
Lexicon of grammaticalization (Heine & Kuteva 2002):

• *come to* (found in Lahu, Tchien, Krahn), this type of grammaticalization reflects a more general process: process verbs are grammaticalized to auxiliaries denoting tense or aspect functions

• *want* (Ani, Ewe, Chamus, dialect of Maa, Chrau, Hungarian, Persian): verbs are grammaticalized to markers denoting tense or aspect functions
• *love* (Lingala, Tok Pisin PE) representing a special case of a development: love > want > proximative

• *near* (Swahili, Seychelles CF) reflecting a development of grammatical aspect functions by locative concepts
Metzler’s dictionary of linguistic terms (*Metzler Lexikon Sprache*):

- **Prospektiv**
- (lat. prospicere 'in die Ferne schauen, Vorsorge treffen') Futurische Aspektbedeutung der Präsensformen des Russ. (future aspect meaning of present tense forms of Russian perfective verbs)
- It is an aspect marker
L. Johanson. *Aspekt im Türkischen*

• L. Johanson opposes prospective forms to interaterminal, terminal and postterminal aspects and defines the Turkish form –*acak* as a prospective one (aspect marker)
Semantic features of PROS/PROX

Components of the PROS semantics
deictic, inferential, modal

Semantic types of PROS/PROX
General versus Near Prospective
To be going to do something
Versus
To be about to do something

Comrie, B.
It is going to rain.

Photo of a Tuvan landscape by Alexandra Sheymovich
A moment ago the car was about to explode, and now it has exploded.

Bad Homburg. The exhibition, “Points of view.”
Avertive

Avertive forms indicate that the anticipated action has not happened.

The action that is expressed by prospective forms may happen or not, but the state of anticipating an action was real.
Jukagir languages have two constructions that satisfy the definition of “Prospective”: intentional prospective and a providential one.
• The intentional prospective roughly corresponds to be going to.
• The providential prospective roughly corresponds to *be marked to*, as in Shakespearean *If we are marked to die* ...
• More precisely, the providential construction signifies an event in future that is predetermined by external circumstances, independent of the intentions of its participants and recognized by the observer as „signs“ of the future in the present.
PROS/PROX versus avertive

- Turkish (1)
  - *Git-mek üzere-yim*
  - go-INF for:POSTP-1SG
  - ‘I am about to go.’

- Altay (2)
  - *Meni sog-o d’asta-d-i-lar.*
  - I:ACC beat-CONV miss-PST-POSS3-PL
  - ‘They have almost beaten me.’
For most languages and language families of Eurasia this category has not been defined yet. And this in spite of the fact that prospective semantics can be already found in classical examples. The reason could be the fact that this semantics does not have any specialized grammatical encoding.
A classical example on the use of Prospective

Remember an ancient salute used by Roman prisoners to be executed in the Colosseum

*Ave Caesar Morituri te Salutant*, by Jean-Léon Gérôme (1859), depicting gladiators greeting Vittelius

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ave_Imperator,_morituri_te_salutant
Ave, imperator, morituri te salutant (Sueton, Claudis 21)
‘Hail emperor, we who are about to die, salute you.’
or
Ave, Caesar, morituri te salutant
‘Hail Caesar, we who are about to die, salute you.’
where *morituri* is the Nominative Plural form of the Future Participle in the Active Voice from
the verb *mori-* ‘die’: *morituri* ‘those who will die, who are going/about to die’.

It is interesting to compare translations of this salute into different
languages:
German: Heil dir, Kaiser (Cäsar), die Todgeweihten grüßen dich!
Russian: До здравствует Цезарь! Идущие на смерть приветствуют тебя!

The situation has changed dramatically in the current century.
Prospective/Proximative as an object of recent research


• JENDRASCHEK, Gerd: Future tense, prospective aspect, and irrealis mood as part of the situation perspective: Insights from Basque, Turkish, and Papuan
  (http://www.academia.edu/1246987/Future_tense_prospective_aspect_and_irrealis_mood_as_part_of_the_situation_perpective_Insights_from_Basque_Turkish_and_Papuan#).


Research on PROS/PROX in Turkic

• For Turkic, Nevskaya 2005 gave a preliminary description of PROS/PROX means and main sources of their development. These are as follows:
  • 1) actional constructions with infinitives of the lexical verb and various auxiliary verbs bearing tense morphology; tense markers getting omitted by certain forms, which then express tense reference themselves and function as near futures
    • (Intention>Prospective)
    • (Purposive> Prospective);
  • 2) constructions of direct speech with volitive forms of the lexical verb
    • (Intention>Prospective);
  • 3) synthetic intraterminal aspect forms of low focality (mainly participles) that tend to develop into prospectives and, finally, into futures
    • (Intraterminal>(Obligation)>Prospective).
The inventory of Turkic PROS/PROX grammar means

- PROS/PROXs with the infinite form of the lexical component
- Altai

*Qazan emdi de qayn-aryə tur-d-ı*

Qazan now PRTCL boil-INF stand:aux-PST-3

‘Qazan is just about to boil’.
The inventory of Turkic PROS/PROX grammar means (intention – prospective)

PROS/PROXs - grammaticalized constructions of direct speech (dep-based constructions)

Kazakh
Tas qūl-ayn de-p tūr
stone fall-IMP1SG say-CV stand:aux
'The stone is going to fall down (lit.: The stone says, ‘I will fall.’)
The Kazakh intention-PROS/PROX form – mAKšI bol

- Is always with animate subjects
- Is combined with various auxiliary verbs expressing different shades of intentional and prospective semantics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>First Person Sg.</th>
<th>Second Person Sg.</th>
<th>Third Person Sg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return</td>
<td>return-VN</td>
<td>return-VN</td>
<td>return-VN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be</td>
<td>be-CV</td>
<td>be-CV</td>
<td>be-CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘(S)he is going to go (home)’ – in the context: but s/he does not leave

O1   qayt-paqšī  bol-īp  žūr
s/he return-VN  be-CV  wander

‘(S)he is going to go (home)’ – I see that s/he is going to leave

O1   qayt-paqšī  bol-īp  otīr
s/he return-VN  be-CV  sit

‘(S)he is going to go (home)’ – s/he decided to leave

O1   qayt-paqšī  bol-īp  žat-īr
s/he return-VN  be-CV  lie-AOR

‘(S)he is going to go (home)’ – s/he intends to leave

Compare to the dep-based construction which is prospective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>First Person Sg.</th>
<th>Second Person Sg.</th>
<th>Third Person Sg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return</td>
<td>return-IMP1SG</td>
<td>return-IMP1SG</td>
<td>return-IMP1SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say</td>
<td>say-CV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand/Wander/Sit/Lie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘(S)he is going to go (home)’
The inventory of Turkic PROS/PROX grammar means

**Synthetic PROS/PROXs in South Siberian Turkic**

- **Shor**
  
  *Par-argača-m*
  
  *go-PROSP-1SG*
  
  ‘I am going to go’

- **Khakas**
  
  *Sug taza-rγa čör*
  
  *river swell-INF wander:aux*
  
  ‘The river is going to be very high very soon’

- **Chalk.**
  
  [Anna Kandarakova]
  
  *Sooq-tar kel-ereyt.*

- **Sooq-tar**
  
  *kel-ereyt.*

- **frost-PL**
  
  *come-PROSP*

- ‘Frosts are coming (are just about to come).’
Perfective to Proximaties

- Intransitive accomplishment verbs such as püt- ‘to be completed, to be constructed, to be ready’, piš- ‘to be ready, to be cooked, to ripen’, bol- ‘to become’ in the -(i)b / -(i)p converb form, constructed with the auxiliary qal- ‘to stay, to remain’ in the past tense, create proximatives in Uyghur and in Uzbek; e.g.:

  - Kiyim  püt-üp qal-di.  (Uyghur)
  Dress  be.complete-CVB  stay-PST.3SG
  ‘The dress is about to be ready’

  - Ovqat  pišib  qol-di.  (Uzbek)
  Food  cook-CVB  stay-PST.3SG
  ‘The food is about to be ready.’
Providential PROS/PROXs

The future participle –Ar
Shor: \textit{par-ar} kiži ‘a person who will go /is going to go’

The participle –Caŋ
Shor: \textit{par-čaŋ} kiži ‘a person who will inevitably go’

The Tuvan participle –GAIAk
Xün ün-gelek
Sun rise-PART
‘The sun is about to rise (while observing the sky).

The Altay participle –AtAn
\textit{Qoncert-te} turuž-atan
concert-LOC take.part-PART
\textit{bal-dar} kel-gen
child-PL come-PF
‘Children who are going to take part in the concert have come.’
Symmetrical Proximative in Old Turkic

M. Erdal:
-yOk anterior proximative (has just happened)
-gAllr posterior proximative (is about to happen)

Compare „perspective“ by Dick

S. Dik distinguishes four types within the ‘perspective aspect’, two of which are special cases of the prospective: 1) prospective (is going to cry); immediate prospective (is about to cry); 3) recent perfect (has just cried); 4) perfect (has cried, and it is relevant at the moment) [Dik, 1997. P. 239]
Further proximative means

Locative proximatives –mAk üzere (Türkish)
Preterite –D: kettik ‘We are gone – We are about to leave’ (Kazakh)
Reduplications: -D – AcAk (Turkish)

Borrowed proximatives (Southern Azeri):
Want/Go + Subjunctive (from Persian)
Etc.

The counterexample: Borrowings of Turkic constructions into Sayan Samoyed languages Kamas and Mator.
Some intermediate results

• Even PROX languages as Turkic ones do not have a SINGLE common proximative.

• A great semantic and formal diversity in spite of the fact that already OT had a lot of proximative morphology traced mostly in Siberian and Kypchak Turkic nowadays.

• Low grammaticalization degree of most PROX means cross-linguistically.

• As a consequence, no descriptions in grammar books available.
The Prospective as a Grammatical Category: Evidence from Turkic, Iranian and beyond

International Symposium
September 23-25, 2013

As a cross-linguistic phenomenon, the prospective has attracted the attention of general linguistics only recently.

Mae hi ar fin bwrw glaw.
It’s about to rain.
Bārān āmad.
Наа̀бур чăарăчаър.

Welsh
English
Persian
Shor

The areal distribution of prospective forms and phenomena of language contact have not yet been studied. Other topics that need to be investigated include the relations between the categories of Prospective, Future, Intention and further phenomena dealing with planned and/or anticipated actions.

Yamghur yaghay dāp turidu. (Lit.: rain says, ‘let me fall’)
Modern Uyghur

Д’ангырларга д’астаган түрбай.
Altai-kizi

Boraan ča:arya duru.
Dzungar Tuvan

Nerdeyse yağmur yağacak.
Turkish

The Symposium will provide a forum to present case studies of a large number of Turkic and Iranian varieties in contact with each other, as well as with other languages (Mongolic, Tungusic, Ugric, Armenian, Aramaic, etc.).

http://titus.ikig1.uni-frankfurt.de/prospective/
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Registration, Welcome, Introduction
13:45 General Introduction
What to look for: morphology of prospectives and futures in Iranian Old Iranian
16:00 Sogdian
The categories of Prospective and Future in comparison (on Old Turkic material)
Uyghur and Uzbek prospective constructions
Karakalpak and Kirgiz prospective forms (with S. Tazhibaeva)
Karakalpak and Kirgiz prospective forms (with I. Nevskaya)

Prospective in Khalaj and Sayan Turkic
Azeri (Iran) and Persian in contact
Azeri (Azerbaijan) prospective forms

An overview of prospective formations in Tat languages
The Ossetic prospective – between aspect and modality
Between prospective and future: the case of Eastern Armenian
Simple past for immediate future in some Iranian languages

Standard Altay expressions of prospectivity*
The ways of expressing prospective semantics in Altai dialects (with A. Tazranova)*
The ways of expressing prospective semantics in Altai dialects (with A. Ozonova)*
Khakas prospective language means*
On the category of prospective in Tuvan (with L. Shamina)*
On the category of prospective in Tuvan (with A. Bayyr-ool)*
Prospective, future and intention in Dolgan*
Tuba prospective forms*

Prospective forms in Ottoman Turkish
Prospective forms in Karaim in comparison to other Kipchak
Nogay prospective forms

Prospectivity in the Volga-Kama Sprachbund
Khanty language means of expressing Prospective
Prospective constructions in Kamas and Mator
Prospective forms in Nenec

Prospective structures in Pashto (with sideviews on Classical Persian)
Expressions of prospectivity in Turkish
Prospective and avertive in Eastern Neo-Aramaic dialects

Mongolic prospective forms
Periphrastic Prospectives in the Dialects of Even
Typological features of prospective forms: the case of Central Saharan languages

http://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/prospective/
Languages treated

Turkic
Mongolian
Tungusic
Iranian
Ob-Ugric
Russian
Etc.
Hanty and Russian PROX (Natal’ja Koshkarjova, Novosibirsk)

• Various lexical means to encode PROX

• In Russian, вот-вот ‘about to’ combined only with perfective verbs in future tense, often combined with other modal markers, usually with должен ‘must, ought’, as well as готов, предстоит ‘is ready, lays ahead’.

• In Hanty, the particle śi / či ‘almost’ reminds us of the symmetrical proximative in Old Turkic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khanty</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>śi / či ‘about to’</td>
<td>вот-вот</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr (the prospective)</td>
<td>Perf Fut (the prospective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST (the perfective)</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>Modality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The PROS/PROX are categories widely represented in languages of various systems. However, in each case, the limits of these categories depend on highly varied individual traits of each language, which results in broad variations of their interpretations. In this case, it is reasonable to define the PROS/PROX as comparative concepts [Haspelmath, 2010], which are products of linguistic abstraction and not the same as the PROS/PROX as descriptive categories in specific languages.
•Thank you!