

Is There Any Inflectional Future in East Slavic? A Case of Ukrainian against Romance Reopened

Andrii Danylenko

To the Memory of Carol F. Justus († 8.1.2007)

1. Matching Ukrainian with Romance

In his survey of future markers in European languages, Östen Dahl analyzed a series of grammatical devices, or ‘future grams,’ including Slavic simplex (perfective presence) and complex (periphrastic) constructions, from the areal-linguistic point of view.¹ This author also argued that the distribution of gram families fits the *Wellentheorie* rather than the *Stammbaumtheorie*, thereby implying that prototypically a grouping of languages that have undergone the same grammaticalization process is anchored in areal diffusion rather than independent development in genetically related or unrelated languages.²

In this paper, I intend to focus on the so-called ‘synthetic future’ (SF)³ which is derived from the imperfective infinitive of the main verb

1 Östen Dahl, “The Grammar of Future Time Reference in European Languages,” in Östen Dahl, ed., *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe* (Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000), pp. 309–328.

2 Dahl, “The Grammar of Future Time Reference,” p. 317.

3 S. P. Bevzenko et al., *Istoriya ukrajins'koji movy. Morfolohija* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1978), pp. 254, 328–329; Ivan Vyxovanec’ and Kateryna

followed by the otherwise no longer used auxiliary of the *e/u* type in the present tense, e.g., *pysaty-mu* ‘I shall write,’ *pysaty-meš* ‘you will write’ and the like.⁴ Dahl juxtaposed the Ukrainian SF with other Indo-European inflectional futures derived from periphrastic sources.⁵ Indeed, numerous Romance languages (Italian, French, Portuguese, Spanish, Occitan, Catalan, Romanish) are based on the grammaticalization of obligation markers typically involving a possessive verb ‘to have’ (from Lat. *habere*) plus a non-finite main verb, cf. the French simplex future *je ferai* ‘I shall do’ next to a de-obligative PC in postclassical Latin *dicere habeo* ‘I have to say’ from *quid habes dicere?* ‘what do you have to say.’⁶

At first blush, structurally similar to the Romance inflectional future, the allegedly equivalent Ukrainian formation belongs to the same

Horodens’ka, *Teoretyčna morfolohija ukrajins’koji movy* (Kyiv: Pul’sary, 2004), p. 254.

The following abbreviations are used in this paper: ACC – accusative, Bel. – Belarusian, Cz. – Czech, F – feminine, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, GERV – gerundive, Gk. – Greek, Goth. – Gothic, Gr. – German, Hg. – Hungarian, IE – Indo-European, IMP – imperative, INF – Infinitive, IPRF – imperfective, Lat. – Latin, Lith. – Lithuanian, LCS – Late Common Slavic, LOC – locative, LSorb. – Lower Sorbian, M – masculine, MHGr. – Middle High German, Mo – Modern, MRuss. – Middle Russian, NUkr. – North Ukrainian, OCS – Old Church Slavonic, ORus. – Old Russian, PC – periphrastic construction, PF – periphrastic future, PPP – past/perfect passive participle, PRF – perfective, PL – plural, Pol. – Polish, PRES – present, PRET – preterit, PTP – participle, RP – resultative participle, Rum. – Rumanian, Russ. – Russian, Serb. – Serbian, SEUkr. – Southeast Ukrainian, SF – synthetic future, SG – singular, Slk. – Slovak, SWUkr. – Southwest Ukrainian, USorb. – Upper Sorbian, WE – West European.

4 George Y. Shevelov, “Ukrainian,” in Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett, eds., *The Slavonic Languages* (London, New York: Routledge, 1993), pp. 947–998 (p. 971).

5 Dahl, “The Grammar of Future Time Reference,” p. 319.

6 Jerzy Kuryłowicz, “Les temps composés du roman,” *Prace filologiczne* 15:2 (1931), pp. 448–453 (p. 452); Harm Pinkster, “The Strategy and Chronology of the Development of Future and Perfect Tense Auxiliaries in Latin,” in Martin Harris and Paolo Ramat, eds., *Historical Developments of Auxiliaries* (Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1987), pp. 193–223 (p. 209).

gram family, whilst demonstrating a typological restriction in that the latter occurs only with imperfectives. The core features of the Ukrainian imperfective SF are purported to be identical with the “more famous Romance inflectional future” in that the Ukrainian tense derived from the merger of the infinitive of the main verb with a postposed auxiliary which is “originally the verb ‘have’ (*imati*).”⁷ Dahl observed that the Ukrainian SF occurred alongside the copular imperfective future construed with an *l*-participle or infinitive in North (West and East) Slavic, and there seemed to be no difference on meaning.⁸ The innovative character of the Ukrainian inflectional future is supported by the fact that ‘to have,’ as Dahl believes, was used as a future-marking auxiliary in the other East Slavic languages at an earlier stage, but the inflectional variety was not attested.

Dahl seems to be the first Western scholar to draw a parallel between the Romance and East Slavic (Ukrainian) inflectional future.⁹ In

7 Dahl, “The Grammar of Future Time Reference,” p. 319.

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 319, 324.

9 Ukrainian scholars have not paid much attention to this parallelism since the appearance of two pioneering studies by I. V. Šarovol’s’kyj, “Pryjdučyj čas na -mu,” in *Zapysky Istoryčno-Filolohičnoho Viddilu UVAN* 13–14 (1927), pp. 284–293; and Vasyl’ Dem’jančuk, “Čy rumuns’koho poxodžennja formy pryjdučocho na -mu?” *Zapysky Istoryčno-Filolohičnoho Viddilu UVAN* 18 (1928), pp. 313–317, the latter offering criticism of the former’s hypothesis about the loan nature of the Ukrainian SF. These studies charted future research on this issue (cf. V. G. Gak, “Tipologija analitičeskix form glagola v slavjanskix jazykax (irradiacija i konkatenacija),” *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2 (1997), pp. 47–58) and since then have been sporadically cited in university textbooks and reference grammars (see S. P. Bevenko, “Formy vyjavu majbytnjoi diji v ukrajins’kyx dialektax,” in *Ukrajins’kyj dialektolohičnj zbirnyk*, vol. 3 (Kyiv: Dovira, 1997), pp. 213–217). Šarovol’s’kyj, “Pryjdučyj čas na -mu,” posited isomorphism in the development of the Romance PF with the auxiliary ‘to have’ and the Ukrainian future marker derived purportedly from an identical Slavic lexical verb ‘to have.’ He argued that the Ukrainian SF was influenced by Rumanian, despite the fact that this is the only Romance language in which the futurity is expressed with the help of the auxiliary *vrea* ‘to wish’ and a non-finite main verb, e.g., (*v*)oi (want-1SG.PRES) *cînta* ‘I shall sing’ with a possible postposing of the auxiliary after

fact, as early as 2002 Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva disregarded this parallel in their Source-Target lexicon of grammatical concepts that emerged due to grammaticalization of the corresponding lexical forms.¹⁰ In discussing the development of the inflectional future tense marker, H-POSSESSIVE > (2) FUTURE, in the major Romance and some non-IE languages, the authors mentioned, among Slavic parallels, one (colloquial) Bulgarian future tense construction *ima* (have-3SG.PRES) *da* (PTP) *xodja* (go-1SG.PRES.IPRF) ‘I shall go.’ In general, the paucity of pertaining (Slavic) material made them belittle typological saliency of this kind of grammaticalization for the development of future markers cross-linguistically.

Premised though on the postulates of the *Wellentheorie*, Dahl stopped short of providing an areal (contact-induced) explanation of the Ukrainian SF, apparently, because of the peripheral position of Ukrainian in the corresponding inflectional future gram family, containing the “more famous [? – *A. D.*] Romance inflectional future.” His stance on the northern Slavic PF *budu* (be-FUT) + INF.IPRF, on the contrary, is wholly areal-oriented.¹¹ Accordingly, the infinitive future might have spread from the Czech area at the end of the thirteenth century, showing up in Polish, Belarusian, and Ukrainian at the end of the 14th century

the infinitive cross-dialectally, cf. Theodor Gartner, *Darstellung der Rumänischen Sprache* (Halle: Von Max Niemeyer, 1904), pp. 183, 196; Al. Graur, ed., *Gramatica limbii române*, vol. 1 (București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1966), pp. 269–270. Based on copious evidence from Old and Middle Ukrainian records, Demjančuk “Čy rumuns’koho poxožennja formy pryjdučoho na *-mu*?” pp. 314–315, dismissed any Rumanian influence on the emergence of the SF in Ukrainian. According to him, neither the alleged closeness between Ukr. *-mu* (1SG) and Rum. *vrea* nor similarity of Lat. *habere* and OCS/ORus. *imamъ* (have-1SG) could attest to their genetic relationship.

10 Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002), pp. 242–243.

11 See Figure 1 in Dahl, “The Grammar of Future Time Reference,” p. 318. For the opposite view, see Helena Křížková, *Vývoj opisného futura v jazycích slovanských, zvláště v ruštině* (Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1960), pp. 86–105.

and in Russian in the 15th century.¹² Yet the accuracy of this chronology calls for revision.¹³ Moreover, Ukrainian data are likely to cast doubt on the alleged spread of the PF *budu* + INF across the Ukrainian-language speaking territories. In particular, it is necessary to explain the status of another Ukrainian PF of the type *budu* + *l*-FORM, e.g., SWUkr. *budu* (FUT.AUX.1SG) *robyv* (< *robilь*-M.SG.RP) 'I shall do' evolved from a combination of the auxiliary 'to be' with the resultative past participle from imperfectives, and, historically, from perfectives.¹⁴ If the latter for-

12 Dahl, "The Grammar of Future Time Reference," p. 324, follows here, in general, Elizabeth Leiß, "Zur Entstehung des neuhochdeutschen analytischen Futurs," *Sprachwissenschaft* 10 (1985), pp. 250–273, who argued that the east-to west diffusion in German and the opposite diffusion from West Slavic to Muscovy together point to Prague as the center from which this new future was propagated.

13 Křížková, *Vývoj opisného futura*, pp. 86–87, 94–95, pointed out some functional and chronological discrepancies in this hypothesis. Thus, as early as the 14th century, the German speakers had at their disposal, on the one hand, demodal constructions with *sollen* 'must' and especially *wollen* 'to want,' and, on the other hand, paraphrases with *werden* 'to become' in combination with present participles and infinitives, e.g., *ich werde sehende* or *ich werde sehen*, correspondingly. Ultimately, as Křížková argued, constructions with the infinitive prevailed, though constructions with the present participle of the main verb, usually with the inceptive meaning, occurred in parallel use for a long period of time. In Middle Czech, however, there was no similar distribution. Combinations of the stem *bud-* with *l*-participle, a very rare construction at that time, had a special status in the tense system, being not related with the infinitive construction; combinations with the present active participle were also rare in Middle Czech (cf. Jan Gebauer, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého*, vol. 3(2): *Časování* (Praha: F. Tempský, 1909), p. 434). In addition, the infinitive construction with *werden*, spreading from the northernmost of the High German dialects, shaped during the time span of 1375 to 1450, while a similar Middle Czech construction became the only future marker available for the imperfective use in the late 13th century (Křížková, *Vývoj opisného futura*, pp. 94, 99).

14 I. H. Matvijas et al., eds., *Atlas ukrajins'koji movy*, vol. 2: *Volyn, Naddnistrjanščyna i sumižni zemli* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1988), map 244; I. M. Kernyc'kyj, *Systema slovozmyny v ukrajins'kij movi* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1967), pp. 230–231.

mation was influenced by the parallel Polish (indigenous) construction with *l*-participles from, unlike Ukrainian and Belarusian, imperfectives only, one can reasonably question the alleged diffusion of the PF *budu* + INF from the west across Ukrainian-Belarusian Ruthenia toward medieval Muscovy. Speaking about Muscovy, Henning Andersen wondered how a relatively tenuous trade or diplomatic contact would have enabled this kind of diffusion in a language area as large as the Russian.¹⁵ All suggests therefore that this type of the PF was long established in some Russian (in general, East Slavic) dialects that just happen not to be attested. Hence a disparate treatment of the two future grams in Ukrainian, where the SF holds, to be sure, a unique position.

Overall, the theory about a parallelism between the Ukrainian SF and its analogous Romance formation is riddled with theoretical and factual *lacunae* that warrant a more detailed investigation in terms of areal distribution and diachronic typology. The above hypothesis is based occasionally on misunderstanding of pertinent diachronic material. All this is likely to diminish the typological validity of the thesis about the inflectional character of the Ukrainian SF, structurally reminiscent of the Romance future from a Latin de-obligative PC of the type INF + *habere* ‘to have.’ Accordingly, it is the purpose of this study to compare the grammaticalization process of the two future tense formations in Romance and East Slavic, with the main focus placed on Ukrainian. I venture to argue that areal anchoring of the Ukrainian SF, as implicitly implied by Dahl,¹⁶ may blur the actual grammaticalization path of this future marker and the extent of its genetic and typological proximity to the alleged morphosynthetic congener in Romance. I will try therefore to sketch a developmental scenario capable of refuting the thesis about the inflectional character of the modern Ukrainian SF and suggesting that this form can hardly belong to the gram family (in Dahl’s terms) or

15 Henning Andersen, “Periphrastic Futures in Slavic: Divergence and Convergence,” in Kerstin Eksell and Thora Vinther, eds., *Change in Verbal Systems: Issues in Explanation* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006), pp. 9–45.

16 Östen Dahl, “Principles of Areal Typology,” in Martin Haspelmath et al., eds., *Language Typology and Language Universals: An International Handbook*, vol. 2 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2001), pp. 1456–1470.

grammaticalization area (in Heine's and Kuteva's terms) shared by the Romance inflectional future.

2. Point of Misconception: 'to have' or 'to take'?

My main claim is that, though seemingly analogous, the grammaticalization of the Ukrainian SF is different from the Romance one. The typological difference lies in the choice of auxiliary – which as I will try to show, is not identical in East Slavic and Romance – and its subsequent grammaticalization in Ukrainian (sections 3, 6–6-3).

While positing the verb *imati* 'to have' (which is in fact the imperfective LCS **jīmati* – *jemljō* 'to take') as a source of the auxiliary used as a bound affix in the SF form, Dahl followed the outdated East Slavic scholarly tradition, which in the late 19th–early 20th centuries did not distinguish between the de-modal extension of *iměti* 'to have' and the inceptive (phasal) verb *jati* 'to take.' It is not surprising then that Dahl took it for granted that the Ukrainian SF originated from a paraphrase comprised of the modal verb *imati* 'to have to' + INF.¹⁷ As late as 2005, Heine and Kuteva admitted that Ukrainian had a future tense using the verb 'to take' as a future auxiliary.¹⁸ Surprisingly, however, the authors did not mention this fact in the entry on grammaticalization of the type *take* ('to take,' 'to seize') > *future* in Chinese and Hungarian.¹⁹

17 See Křížková, *Vývoj opisného futura*, pp. 111–112. To name a few names, A. I. Sobolevskij, *Lekcii po istorii russkogo jazyka* (Moscow, 1907), pp. 237–238; N. N. Durnovo, *Izbrannye raboty po istorii russkogo jazyka* (Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, 2000), p. 319, and Ol. Šaxmatov and Ah. Kryms'kyj, *Narysy z istoriji ukrajins'koji movy ta xrestomatija* (Kyiv: Ukrajins'ka Akademija Nauk, 1924), pp. 104–105, all failed to see any difference between the de-modal extension of 'to have' from the inceptive meaning of a phasal cognate 'to take' in the derivation of the SF. Durnovo, *Izbrannye raboty po istorii russkogo jazyka*, p. 231, also argued that the construction *budu* + INF was not used (any longer) in literary Ukrainian which was based primarily on its southeastern dialects.

18 Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 105; cf. Andrii Danylenko, "Naskil'ky ukrajins'kyj syntetyčnyj majbutnij čas je syntetyčnym?" *Movoznavstvo* 4–5 (2010), pp. 113–121.

19 Heine and Kuteva, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, p. 288.

According to Andersen, the typological parallelism between the Hungarian and Ukrainian use of ‘to take’-verbs (cf. Hg. *fog* ‘to grasp, seize, take’) is more than a coincidence since the Hungarians settled among the Pannoinian Slavs in the current territory around 900.²⁰ Given the fact that Hungarian is spoken on a now lost Slavic substratum, it would be reasonable, as Andersen believes, to assume that its choice of auxiliary for the imperfective future reflects the effects of centuries of Hungarian-Slavic bilingualism.²¹ This hypothesis, however, seems more debatable than the areal interpretation of PF in (Old) Bulgarian, in particular its *xotěti/šte* grammaticalization development. Suffice it to mention the structural and functional isomorphism of the modern Bulgarian PF and a de-volitive PC with the lexical verb *xotity* ‘to want, will’ used as an auxiliary (but not yet an auxiliary clitic) in the Transcarpathian and eastern Ukrainian dialects.²² It is tempting then to assume that the latter paraphrase could have developed in Southwest and East Ukrainian without outside prompting.

To understand the misconception of the auxiliary verb in the Ukrainian SF, whence *imati* ‘to take’ (the imperfective LCS **jĭmati – jemljĭ* ‘to take’) treated as ‘to have’,²³ one should refer to the Common Slavic period. The point is that Common Slavic had three verbs having the same root **em-*, a determined imperfective LCS **jĕti : *jĭmĭ* ‘to take,’ later superseded by numerous prefixed perfectives, an indetermined imperfective LCS **jĭmati : jemljĭ* ‘to take’ which would not take any prefixes, and finally, an imperfective LCS **jĭmĕti : *jĭmamĭ* ‘to hold, own, have.’²⁴ These three verbs came historically confused in East Slavic due

20 Andersen, “Periphrastic Futures in Slavic,” pp. 33–34.

21 Ibid.

22 V. V. Nimčuk, “Ukrajins’ki hovory ta balkans’kyj movnyj sojuz,” in V. M. Rusaniv’s’kyj, ed., *Slov’jans’ke movoznavstvo* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1993), pp. 41–63 (p. 54).

23 Steven Franks and Tracy Holloway King, *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 197.

24 Antoine Meillet, *Le slave commun* (Paris: Champion, 1924), p. 203; André Vaillant, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, vol. 3: *Le verbe* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1966), p. 194.

to the morphonological overlapping,²⁵ in particular of *iměti* ‘to have’ and *jati* ‘to take’ as exemplified in the Middle Ukrainian homonymic *imut*’ from both *iměti* (< **jīměti*) and *jati* (< **jęti*).²⁶

Different from the Italo-Germanic type, as evidenced by Germanic weak class III verbs or Lat. *habēre* : *habēō*, the imperfective LCS **jīměti* : **jīmamī* ‘to have’ must be conceived of as a Slavic formation proper. In general, the innovative status of this formation appears to be in tune with Meillet’s hypothesis, according to which the verb ‘to have’ of the type Gk. ἔχω, Lat. *habēō*, Goth. *haba*, Lith. *turiù*, LCS **jīmamī* could have entered the grammar of late dialectal areas of IE in the aftermath of lengthening and accent-conditioned alternations.²⁷ Judged commonly independent parallel innovations, such verbs arose in tandem with a change in transitivity derivation, while gradually semantically evolving from the original basic meaning ‘to hold (in), (onto); to overcome’ toward the auxiliary use.²⁸

25 Andrii Danylenko, “The East Slavic ‘Have’: Revising a Developmental Scenario,” in Karlene Jones-Bley et al., eds., *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, November 9–10, 2001* (Washington, D. C.: Institute for the Study of Man, 2002), pp. 105–127 (pp. 111–113), Andrii Danylenko, *Predykaty, vidminky i diatezy v ukrajins'kij movi* (Xarkiv: Oko, 2003), pp. 401–404.

26 Andrii Danylenko, “Auxiliary Clitics in Southwest Ukrainian: Questions of Chronology, Areal Distribution, and Grammaticalization,” *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* (2012) (forthcoming).

27 Antoine Meillet, “Le développement du verbe ‘avoir,’” in *Antidōron. Festschrift Jacob Wackernagel zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres am 11. Dezember 1923 gewidmet von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), pp. 9–13.

28 Carol F. Justus, “Indo-European ‘Have’: A Grammatical Etymology,” in Carol F. Justus and Edgar C. Polomé, eds., *Language Change and Typological Variation: In Honor of Winfred P. Lehmann On the Occasion of His 83rd birthday*, vol. 2: *Grammatical Universals and Typology* (Washington, D. C.: Institute for the Study of Man, 1999), pp. 613–641 (p. 616).

3. Grammaticalization of ‘to have’ in Romance

The process of grammaticalization of ‘to have’ in Romance was likely to progress along the same morphosyntactic parameters (from word to clitic and, in tendency, to affix) for both the periphrastic perfect and the future form, a process which Suzanne Fleischman postulated for Romance, Germanic, and Slavic.²⁹ She posited a functional parallelism in the diachronic development of “present perfect” and “near future,” both of which evolved from complex (periphrastic) exponents of aspect, whose pragmatic function was to identify the situation as being of “current relevance” to exponents of tense.³⁰ Viewed through this pragmatic prism, the speaker himself appears to serve as a connecting link from a past event to a situation evolving from the moment of utterance. Consequently, a non-present (either past or future) situation allows for a parallel development of the auxiliaries on either side of the *here-and-now*, that is, in the past (an aspect of retrospection) and the future (an aspect of prospection).³¹

Harm Pinkster argued that the corresponding constructions with *habere* ‘have’ turning into a temporal auxiliary might have emerged from earlier Latin constructions of *habere* + OBJECT, with a *predicativum* referring to its property.³² If viewed in retrospection, the *predicativum*

29 Suzanne Fleischman, “From Pragmatics to Grammar,” *Lingua* 60 (1983), pp. 183–214 (p. 197).

30 Fleischman, “From Pragmatics to Grammar,” pp. 192, 204.

31 The pragmatic interpretation of “prospective” vs. “retrospective” offered in this paper is by and large reminiscent of that in Andersen, “Periphrastic Futures in Slavic,” p. 11, according to whom the future in Late Common Slavic was, for instance, a prospective aspect and its opposite (which one could call the actual) was manifested in present, imperfect, aorist. Yet our understanding of (aspects of) “prospection” (a future situation viewed as resulting from present circumstances) and “retrospection” (a past situation viewed in terms of its present repercussions) (see Fleischman, “From Pragmatics to Grammar,” pp. 191, 192), derives from the distinction of two opposite concept dominations in verbal encoding as represented by the analytic Western European and synthetic (East) Slavic languages (Danylenko, “Auxiliary Clitics in Southwest Ukrainian”).

32 Pinkster, “The Strategy and Chronology of the Development,” pp. 193–223.

marks a property of the object that is due to a former action or process in which it was involved, e.g.:

- | | | | |
|----------|-----------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| (1) Lat. | <i>epistulas</i> | <i>lectas</i> | <i>habeo</i> |
| | letter-ACC.PL | read-ACC.PL.PPP | have-1SG |
| | ‘I have read letters’ | | |

A transition from the above agreeing construction to the one with the lack of agreement between the participial form and the object as attested from the 6th century A.D. onward³³ can be regarded as the last stage of grammaticalization (grammation) of *habere* and a clear sign of its true auxiliary status.³⁴

Viewed prospectively, the *predicativum*, fulfilled by a gerundive, represents a property to be acquired by the object in the future as in the following example:³⁵

- | | | | |
|----------|---|------------------|--------------|
| (2) Lat. | <i>epistulas</i> | <i>legendas</i> | <i>habeo</i> |
| | letter-ACC.PL | read-ACC.PL.GERV | have-1SG |
| | ‘I have letters to read’ / ‘I have to read letters’ | | |

Further auxiliation of ‘to have’ in ‘pseudo-transitive’ PCs of the above type was enhanced by the development of the nominative-accusative sentence type which is evidenced in the typologically innovative (analytical) WE languages as opposed to the Slavic languages remaining

33 Cf. Ph. Thielmann, “*Habere* mit dem Infinitiv und die Entstehung des romanischen Futurums,” *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 2:48 (1885), pp. 156–202.

34 Michela Cennamo, “The Rise and Development of Analytic Perfects in Italo-Romance,” in Thórhallur Eythórsson, ed., *Grammatical Change and Linguistic Theory: The Rosendal papers* (Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2008), pp. 115–142 (p. 119).

35 Brigitte Bauer, *Archaic Syntax in Indo-European: The Spread of Transitivity in Latin and French* (Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000), pp. 255–257.

“loyal to the IE spirit.”³⁶ The spreading of ‘pseudo-transitivity’ might have triggered the extension of the infinitive in the PC with the future time reference, whence the emergence of the infinitive formation with the modality of obligation evolving gradually into the future marker as observed in transition from ‘I have to sing’ to ‘I will sing’ for *cantare habeo*.³⁷

Despite strong similarities in the grammation of *habere* from a lexical verb of possession to an auxiliary, signaled by the lack of agreement between the perfect participle and the object, constructions including perfect participles and those including gerundives did not have the same outcome. The eventual use of infinitives is likely to have first begun in instances where the object was not explicit and then spread to examples including an accusative singular and from there to other contexts, e.g.:³⁸

- (3) Lat. *epistulas* *legere* *habeo*
 letter-ACC.PL read-INF have-1SG
 ‘I have to read letters’ ⇒ ‘I will read letters’

In terms of chronology, one can side with Pinkster’s view that the above construction could have emerged at a fairly early date.³⁹ Overall, while being used in various functions, *habere* was already an auxiliary in the Latin PC, both for the perfect (retrospective) and future time (prospective) reference.⁴⁰ Shifting from marginal uses in particular contexts and registers to core uses, such PCs, in particular those determined by the aspect of prospection, were already undergoing grammaticalization in Late Latin. This chronology can explain why, having undergone further decategorialization and phonetic reduction, the auxiliary *habere* in

36 Antoine Meillet, “Des innovations du verbe slave,” *Revue des Études slaves* 2:1 (1922), pp. 38–46.

37 Kuryłowicz, “Les temps composés du roman,” pp. 448–453 (p. 452); Andrii Danylenko, *Slavica et Islamica* (Münich: Otto Sagner, 2006), p. 199.

38 Bauer, *Archaic Syntax in Indo-European*, p. 257.

39 Pinkster, “The Strategy and Chronology of the Development,” p. 214.

40 Cennamo, “The Rise and Development,” p. 138.

Romance future tense constructions finally turned (regrammatized) into person-and-number markers.

One observation is due at this place. To begin with, the emergence of PCs for both retrospection and prospection is commonly linked to the so-called Action Schema involving an agent, a patient, and some action or activity: *X takes Y > X has, owns Y*.⁴¹ However, the notion of action introduced by Heine for this type of proposition, as well as that of purely syntactic transitivity, warrant revision since transitivity seems to be a matter of degree determined by several factors.⁴² To limit oneself to the relational structure, the verb ‘to have,’ as was conceded by Émil Benveniste, marks a reverse propositional structure with an extrinsic relation, thus differing from the verb ‘to be’ denoting an intrinsic type of the syntactic relation as found in the older Lat. *mihi (I-DAT) est* ‘to me is’ type predicate of possession.⁴³ From this it follows that the verb ‘to have’ as a stative formation in *-ē-* could hardly have derived from ‘to take’ inasmuch as the *-ē-* would have created the syntactically transitive stative ‘to have’ (in Brigitte Bauer’s terms) from an intransitive ‘to hold’ by one minute step in transitivity increase. According to Carol Justus, the meaning of ‘to take,’ in view of an equal number of participants in the relational structure, is thus higher than ‘have’ on a transitivity scale because its object is affected.⁴⁴

To conclude, the emergence of the extrinsic syntactic relation as embedded in the stative *habere* might have led to the development of periphrastic tenses in Latin, in particular for the future time reference. Right-branching *perfectum* formation delivered the Romance periphrastic past (and pluperfect) with the auxiliary remaining proclitic and incompletely grammaticalized in not reaching affix status. Left-branching

41 Cf. Bernd Heine, *Possession: Cognitive Sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 47.

42 Paul J. Hopper and Sandra A. Thompson, “Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse,” *Language* 56:2 (1980), pp. 251–299 (p. 252).

43 Émil Benveniste, “‘Être’ et ‘avoir’ dans leurs fonctions linguistiques,” in Émil Benveniste, *Problèmes de linguistique générale* (Paris: Gallimard, 1966), pp. 187–207.

44 Justus, “Indo-European ‘Have,’” pp. 523, 634.

infinitival formation, on the other hand, resulted in the Romance future (and conditional) with the same auxiliary *habere* completely grammaticalized (degrammatized) in becoming a person-and-number ending.

4. Profiling East Slavic Future Markers

What is left to investigate is the pathway of evolution of the SF in East Slavic. One should recollect here that, based on a specific possessive schema, East Slavic as a *be*-language is opposed to the WE *have*-languages. Vis-à-vis this fundamental opposition, it still remains unclear how to tackle the problem of the alleged parallelism between the Romance and East Slavic inflectional futures. If the so-called *have*-oriented possessive patterning is typical of the WE languages, while *be*-oriented patterning is characteristic of East Slavic, one legitimately wonders how the inflectional future with the auxiliary ‘to have’ could have emerged in Ukrainian. The departing point in our discussion, however, must be the fact that Ukrainian, as I demonstrated elsewhere, is a language with a split possessive patterning.⁴⁵ Thus, the use of *be*-constructions prevails in the east (presumably under influence from Russian literary norms), while the use of *have*-constructions in the west is strengthened by Polish traditions. Interestingly, the latter constructions are commonly attested in the Central European Slavic languages (with Czech and Slovak as core languages) which are innovatively *have*-languages trending the developmental line of the so-called Standard Average European.⁴⁶

In view of the split possessive patterning in Ukrainian, it is useful to first look into the innovative character of the Slavic verbs derived from **em-* which were much influenced by the category of aspect, instrumental already in Common Slavic. Placing all the cognates into the developmental context of different PSs that arose in the late Common Slavic period and later, will enable us to explain why Ukrainian introduced only rudimentarily the extrinsic relation (in Émil Benveniste’s terms), marked by a possessive schema with ‘to have,’ for the futurity. Consequently, I

45 Danylenko, “The East Slavic ‘Have’,” pp. 118–120.

46 Cf. Helena Kurzová, “Mitteleuropa als Sprachareal,” *Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Philologica 5. Germanistica Pragensia* 13 (1996), pp. 57–73.

will illustrate that the Ukrainian SF is a continuation of the de-inceptive PC with a weak grammaticalization of the auxiliary *jati* (< **jęti*) ‘to take’ historically undergoing grammation along the clitic continuum as I postulated elsewhere for the Ukrainian-speaking territories.⁴⁷

We are left at this point with a question as to what exactly might have made some scholars to believe that the bound morpheme *-mu* (FUT.1SG) in the modern SF might be the reflex of **jǐmęti* ‘to have,’ e.g., *čytaty-mu* (to read-FUT.1SG) ‘I will read.’ The reason seems to lie in the development of *i* after *j* in the imperfective stative **jǐmęti* ‘to have’ and the indetermined imperfective *jǐmati* ‘to take.’ Ukrainian, as well as Belarusian and, with rare exceptions, West Slavic, have preserved the initial *i* reinforced by the preceding *j* in historical reflexes of **jǐmati*, while in **jǐmęti* this sound followed subsequently the development of weak *jers*: cf. Pol. *imać* ‘to take, catch’ vs. *mieć* ‘to have,’ LSorb. *jimaś* vs. *měś*, USorb. *jimać* vs. *měć*, Slk. *imat’* vs. *mat’*, Cz. *jímati* vs. *míti*, in Ukrainian only *maty*, in Belarusian *mec’* ‘to have.’⁴⁸

However, Ukrainian and Belarusian represent a special case because of partial overlapping of the verbs *imęti* ‘to have’ and *imati* ‘to take’ and in the latter, of the imperfectives **jǐmę* and **jǐmati*. This overlapping as embedded in Ukr. *maty* seems to be a reason behind the misinterpretation of the Ukrainian SF by some scholars.

5. Evidence from Old Church Slavonic and East Slavic

To reconstruct the process of auxiliation in the Ukrainian SF, one should look into possible interference from the futurity PCs in earlier ancestral languages – Old Church Slavonic and East Slavic. To begin with, a future does not appear in all IE languages. Nor is it found in Old (Church) Slavic.⁴⁹ Instead, there are numerous various paraphrases used

47 Danylenko, “Auxiliary Clitics in Southwest Ukrainian.”

48 George Y. Shevelov, *A Prehistory of Slavic* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965), p. 441; Danylenko, *Slavica et Islamica*, pp. 205–206.

49 From the time of Franz Miklosich onward, scholarly tradition has taken it for granted that OCS *byšęšte-je/byšęšte-je* is a reflex of the future tense in *-s- or *-sǐ-, cf. Calvert Watkins, *Indogermanische Grammatik*, vol. 3: *Formenlehre*,

in Church Slavonic for future events. Among them, one should name infinitive constructions based on de-modal meanings of *imamb* (1SG) (*iměti*) ‘to have’ and *xoštq* (1SG) (*xotěti/xb̄těti*) ‘to want, will.’ Revealing an inceptive nuance, another arising PF was attested with the verb (*vb-/na-*) *četi* ‘to begin.’ In addition to the above periphrastic formations, Radoslav Večerka also mentioned the so-called *futurum exactum*, the present tense of imperfectives used in reference to the future, a PC of *bqđq* (be-1SG) with an active participle, as well as a somewhat dubious imperfective futurity expression derived with the help of the prefix *po-*.⁵⁰

Večerka argued that the periphrastic formations were not yet completely grammaticalized. Indeed, the verbs *iměti* ‘to have’ and *xotěti/xb̄těti* ‘to want’ were used in such PCs as de-modal extensions rather than auxiliaries.⁵¹ To take *iměti* as an example, its modality was difficult to distinguish from the temporal meaning proper in most of the contexts, e.g., OCS *to kako imamb* (have-1SG.PRES) *rozuměti* ‘[and] how have I to understand that’ (*καὶ πῶς ἔχομεν γινῶναι*).⁵² For that reason, in Church Slavonic translations of the New Testament, the infinitive construction with the said verb corresponded largely with the so-called ‘futuristic subjunctive’ as observed in combination with the idiomatic ‘double negative’ *οὐ μὴ*,⁵³ quite commonplace in New Testament Greek.⁵⁴

part 1: *Geschichte der indogermanischen Flexion* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1969), p. 216. But it should be noted that the said solitary participle, hitherto almost universally regarded as evidence for the former existence of *-sĭ-*future in Slavic should now be left out of account (Oswald J. L. Szemerényi, *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 286) since it is a fairly late innovation formed from the corresponding aorist, whence not only a future but also a past meaning, cf. Vaillant, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, pp. 103–104.

50 Radoslav Večerka, *Altkichenslavische (altbulgarische) syntax*, vol. 2: *Die innere Satzstruktur* (Freiburg im Breisgau: U. W. Weiher – Freiburg I. Br., 1993), p. 175; cf. Křížková, *Vývoj opisného futura*, pp. 60–82.

51 Večerka, *Altkichenslavische (altbulgarische) syntax*, pp. 176–177.

52 *Ibid.*, p. 179.

53 Henryk Birnbaum, *Untersuchungen zu den Zukunftsbeschreibungen mit dem Infinitiv im Altkirchenslavischen* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958), p. 215ff.

54 Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen*

In Old Church Slavonic translations, especially of the Greek ‘futuristic subjunctive,’ Slavic *iměti* was likely to show a de-modal meaning of the German type ‘sollen.’⁵⁵ It is not surprising that, according to Křížková’s statistics, the construction with *iměti* was used in a number of Old Church Slavonic texts to render the Greek sigmatic future only in eight environments.⁵⁶ A rare and independent case of the future time reference seems to be represented by a well-known example of the paraphrase with a non-finite main verb as found in the *Ostromir Gospel* of 1056–57 (Lk 18:22, Mt 19:21):

- (4) OCS *vьsa jeliko imaaši prodaždь i razdai ništiimъ*
 all much have-2SG.PRES sell-2SG.IMP and give-2SG.IMP
 poor-DAT.PL
*iměti imaaši sьkrovišče na n/e/b/e/se*⁵⁷
 have-INF have-2SG.PRES treasure-ACC.SG.N on haven-
 LOC.SG.N
 πάντα ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον καὶ διάδος πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις
 θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῶ
 ‘sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou
 shalt have treasure in heaven’

Aleksandr Vostokov and Oleksandr Potebnja treated *imaaši* in the above-mentioned example as an auxiliary.⁵⁸ Furthermore, Potebnja drew a parallel between the above ‘future [tense] without nuances’ and the Bulgarian future tense, based on the particle *šte* or *da* in combination with an infinitive. In both formations, according to Potebnja, one dealt

Griechisch (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), pp. 294–295; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (New York: Hopper and Stoughton, 1923), p. 929.

55 Večerka, *Altkichenslavische (altbulgarische) syntax*, p. 179.

56 Křížková, *Vývoj opisného futura*, p. 65.

57 A. Vostokov, ed., *Ostromirovo Evangelie 1056–57 goda* (Sanktpeterburg, 1843), pp. 111a, 77b.

58 Vostokov, ed., *Ostromirovo Evangelie 1056–57 goda*, p. 129; A. A. Potebnja, *Iz zapisok po ruskoj grammatike*, vol. 1–2 (Moscow: Učpedgiz, 1958), p. 355.

with a similar time reference phenomenon when the future denoted an event ensuing from the previous one predicated in the first clause.⁵⁹ Despite certain reservations articulated by Křížková,⁶⁰ one can accept an-

59 By citing the same sentence, Večerka, *Altkichenslavische (altbulgarische) syntax*, p. 179, admitted that the PC with *iměti* used in place of the Greek sigmatic future could function as a true future tense form. He noted also a strong resemblance between such Church Slavonic constructions with ‘to have’ occurring after the infinitive and the SF in Ukrainian, although, as was already mentioned, the original auxiliary in this case was, in fact, a cognate verb ‘to take.’

60 The main counterargument adduced by Křížková, *Vývoj opisného futura*, pp. 66, 115, leans on the fact that the corresponding formation in Bulgarian is the only possible future tense category, while East Slavic constructions with *iměti* would reveal an additional semantic nuance similar to that in Gr. μέλλω ‘to intend.’ Potebnja, *Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike*, p. 353, who criticized Miklosich’s theory about the loan character of the future tense in Bulgarian, Rumanian and modern Greek, posited internal motivation behind its development. Today, however, it is widely accepted that the spread of the de-volitive future as a salient Balkanism in Greek, Tosk Albanian, Rumanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Serbian, Croatian, and Romani was contact-induced but nevertheless universally observable process of grammaticalization (Blaže Koneski, *Istorija na makedonskiot jazik* (Skopje: Kultura, 1967), pp. 205–207; Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*, p. 190). Historically, this instance of allegedly areal diffusion in the Balkans seems to be corroborated by the fact that, unlike all other Slavic languages, the PC with *iměti* was liberally used in Old Church Slavonic, presumably under the influence of Byzantine vernacular constructions with ‘to intend’ and ‘to want,’ as well as the Late Latin formation with the de-modal extension of *habere*. All these auxiliaries seemed to have been grammaticalized to future tense markers at that time (Večerka, *Altkichenslavische (altbulgarische) syntax*, p. 177). However, the areal diffusion (convergence) can hardly explain the common use of a parallel obligational construction in both literary and vernacular Ukrainian, with much less grammaticalized *maju* (*iměju*, *imaju*) ‘to have to’ than *iměti* ‘to have’ in similar Old Church Slavonic PCs (Potebnja, *Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike*, p. 356). One can wonder why the de-volitive future in Bulgarian, as claimed by Dahl, “The Grammar of Future Time Reference,” p. 323, is an exemplary (convergent) *Sprachbund* phenomenon, while the de-obligative construction must be regarded as indigenous (see Vladimir Gergiev, “Vůznikvane na novi složni glagolni formi sūs spomagatelen glagol ‘imam,’” *Izvestija na Instituta za bŭlgarski ezik*

teriority of the event as expressed in the subordinate clause, while the *iměti*-construction denotes an ensuing event in the main clause. It is not accidental that in East Slavic sentences with the predication of anteriority in the subordinate clause, one happens on the conditional conjunction *aščē* ‘if,’ as found, for instance, in the Laurentian Codex (1377):

- (5) ORuss. *aščē ty kr/e/s/tišisę vsi imuť to že stvoriti*⁶¹
 if you get.baptized-2SG.PRES all have-3PL.PRES
 same do-INF
 ‘If you get baptized, [then] everybody will do the same’

6. Periphrastic Constructions in Ukrainian

Paraphrases premised on the de-modal extension of *iměti* ‘to have’ were attested in all the East Slavic languages.⁶² However, in Medieval Russia, that type of the PC was stylistically marked, thus occurring primarily in Church Slavonic and bookish texts. Due to the cultural expansion of Ruthenia into Muscovy, this construction might have been ‘replicated’ by Russians in some genres and styles under the influence of the literary tradition cultivated in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

5 (1957), pp. 31–59 (p. 43)). Not surprisingly, Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*, p. 104, admitted that there was no reliable evidence on which Balkan language provided the ultimate model for the grammaticalization of the de-volitive future. The latter thesis prompts us to search for other, non-areal mechanisms behind the emergence of the de-volitive future in Bulgarian, on the one hand, and the de-modal paraphrases in Ukrainian, on the other. Isn’t surprising that, in Transcarpathia and East Ukrainian, future time reference is more often than not rendered by the periphrastic construction with *xotity* ‘to want, will’ used in the de-volitive meaning, cf. Nimčuk, “Ukrajins’ki hovory ta balkans’kyj movnyj sojuz,” pp. 41–63 (p. 54).

61 *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej*, vol. 1: *Lavrent’evskaja letopis’ i Suzdal’skaja letopis’ po akademičeskomu spisku* (Moscow: Vostočnaja literatura 1962), p. 63.

62 Křížková, *Vývoj opisného futura*, pp. 116–120.

This explanation might be tentatively taken for granted inasmuch as the PC with *iměti* was commonplace in Ruthenian (Middle Ukrainian and Belarusian) and Polish that could serve as a source of emanation of the de-modal PC. However, in Middle Ukrainian and Belarusian the paraphrase with *iměti* competed with other (indigenous) constructions with various de-modal and, what is important for the diachronic profiling of the Ukrainian SF, de-phasal extensions in Middle Ukrainian and Belarusian (see section 6-1).

6-1. De-modal Extensions

Despite its frequency, Middle Ukrainian (and Middle Belarusian) de-obligative constructions with *iměti* did not show ‘much futurity,’ retaining its underlying modal semantics. Conceivably, commonly used with both imperfectives and perfectives, their grammation had not yet run to completion in the medieval period.⁶³

A question arises at this point as to the provenance of the above-mentioned de-obligative PC in Middle Ukrainian – was it an independent development or a contact-induced replication? Some chronological observations can prove helpful. First of all, the appearance of the *i*-less form *meti* : *mat* ‘to have’ in Middle Ukrainian in the 15th century could hardly attest to its erosion (phonetic reduction) as a result of grammaticalization, thus signaling the alleged emergence of the PF with the *i*-less verb as a true auxiliary.⁶⁴ Moreover, the *i*-less form was likely to be indigenous rather than a contact-induced phenomenon. Suffice it to

63 Kernyc’kyj, *Systema slovozmyny v ukrajins’kij movi*, p. 234; A. M. Bulyka et al., *Historyčnaja marfalohija belaruskaj movy* (Minsk: Navuka i texnika, 1979), p. 253.

64 The first attestation of an *i*-less form in Old Ukrainian dates to the 12th century. Oleksij Šaxmatov and Ahatanhel Kryms’kyj, *Narysy z istoriji ukrajins’koi movy* (Kyiv: Drukarnja Ukrajins’koi Akademiji Nauk, 1924), pp. 104–105, cited a verbal form from the *Ladder* written in the Černihiv region, *iz’ėdati maty*, erroneously identifying this construction as the earliest example of the SF in Ukrainian – *izjdatyme* ‘he / she will gnaw.’ Clearly, they mistakenly took the *i*-less *imaty/imatъ* (3SG.PRES) of *iměti* ‘to have’ for a form of the imperfective **jĭmati – jemlje* ‘to take,’ cf. Vaillant, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, p. 329.

remind that the Polish *i*-less form *mieć* : *mam* was sporadically attested from 1387 onward, that is, a whole century later than in Ukrainian.⁶⁵ It is, nevertheless, a possibility that the Polish form might have arisen in some dialects much earlier. However, in Poland the center of irradiation of the *mieć*-type forms was Great Poland, while in East Poland, which is close to Ukraine, the *i*-forms were not abandoned till the 16th century.⁶⁶ The latest studies of Larysa Marčylo corroborate the assumption that expression reduction encompassed the verbs *jęti* ‘to take’ and *iměti* ‘to have’ before they were reanalyzed as auxiliary clitics in both de-inceptive and de-modal paraphrases in East Slavic.⁶⁷

There are both philological and typological grounds for positing the indigenous development of the de-obligative PC with the *iměti* / *maty* ‘to have’ in Middle Ukrainian and Belarusian. Thus, this type of construction was attested in various registers and genres, e.g., in the extant writings from the 16th century and even earlier, for instance, in the Ruthenian translation of the Wislica statute (1347), with the predominant use of *i*-less forms.⁶⁸

Viewed from the typological perspective, the development of paraphrases with the de-obligative modality was triggered by the emergence of the verb *iměti* ‘to have’ in Common Slavic. This verb was incorporated in various possessive patterns in historical Slavic dialects, in particular East Slavic.⁶⁹ Historically, Ukrainian acquired a PC with the deontic

65 George Y. Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1979), p. 271.

66 Danylenko, “The East Slavic ‘Have’,” p. 112.

67 Cf. L. M. Marčylo, “‘Zi sposterežen’ nad časovymy formamy dijeslova u pam’jatkax XVIII st.,” in *Problemy hramatyky i leksykologiji ukrajins’koji movy 2* (Kyiv: Ukrajin’s’kyj deržavnyj pedahohičnyj universytet im. M. P. Drahomanova, 2006), pp. 147–157; cf. Roksolana Mykhaylyk, “Diachronic Universals and Morpheme Order in the Ukrainian Synthetic Imperfective Future,” *Morphology* 20 (2010), pp. 359–380 (p. 156).

68 E. F. Karskij, *Belorusy*, vol. 2: *Jazyk belorusskogo naroda*, book 2 (Minsk: Belaruskaja Ėncyklapedyja, 2006), pp. 285–286; Křížková, *Vývoj opisného futura*, p. 119.

69 Danylenko, “The East Slavic ‘Have’.”

modality of obligation and, pragmatically, the prospective orientation, comparable typologically with the corresponding Latin construction.⁷⁰ As was mentioned, the latter became grammaticalized to a future tense category already in Late Latin, while in Ukrainian, where the analogous PC retained the modal meaning, this process did not run to completion. All this attests to a belated shaping of the said paraphrase in East Slavic, especially in Ukrainian. What needs clarification, is what might have strengthened the process of grammaticalization in Ukrainian which, having evolved a minor use pattern, did not result in the formation of a future tense category based on the de-modal extension of the verb ‘to have.’

6-2. *De-inceptive Extensions*

The incomplete grammaticalization of the de-obligative construction in Ukrainian might be linked to a competing formation with the inceptive (phasal) verb *jati* (< LCS **jeti*) ‘to take,’ not found in West and South Slavic. In East Slavic and early Middle Russian, the PC with ‘to take’ occurred concurrently with other inceptive prefixed verbs with *-čati* ‘to begin’ (*načati, počati, učati*). In some Russian-speaking territories the PC of the auxiliary *jati* followed by an infinitive was commonly used in reference to the future until the 16th century.⁷¹ Both types of the de-inceptive paraphrase are attested in some modern Russian dialects, those with the *-čati* in Ustjug and Čerepovec dialects, and with the *jati* in the Novgorod, Vologda, Čerepovec, Kostroma, and Jaroslavl’ regions.⁷² In South Belarusian, as well as in the contiguous Ukrainian area, one happens on the de-inceptive construction with the auxiliary clitic concatenated with the infinitive like *icimu* ‘I will go’ in parallel use with the PF *budu* + INF.⁷³

70 Danylenko, *Predykaty, vidminky i diatezy*, pp. 389–414.

71 Křížková, *Vývoj opisného futura*, pp. 128–129.

72 Sobolevskij, *Lekcii po istorii russkogo jazyka*, p. 238; V. I. Černyšev, “Opisatel’nye formy naklonenij i vremen v russkom jazyke,” in *Trudy Instituta russkogo jazyka* 1 (Moscow, Leningrad, 1949), pp. 216–239.

73 Bulyka et al., *Historyčnaja marfalohija belaruskaj movy*, p. 254; R. I. Avanesaŭ et al., eds., *Dyjalektalahičny atlas belaruskaj movy*, vol. 1 (Minsk: Akademija Nauk Belaruskaj SSR, 1963), map. 166; Karskij, *Belorusy*, p. 207, who first recorded the canonical SF in Hrodna and Navahrudak and other Belar-

The vicissitudes of the Ukrainian SF are well recorded, though some of the pertinent details call for additional comment. First, unlike the Russian paraphrase of the de-inceptive type tending to disappear under the influence of the competing formation *budu* + INF from the early 16th century onward, the de-inceptive construction with the imperfective *jati* (*imati*) ‘to take’ was used in Ukrainian, as well as in some Belarusian dialects, from the late 14th century onward, concurrently with the PF *budu* + INF.⁷⁴ These two imperfective futures are considered today stylistic variants in some textbooks and grammars.⁷⁵ Second, grammaticalization of the verb *jati* (*imati*) ‘to take’ was lagging behind a similar process in the PC *budu* + INF which is well attested cross-dialectally in Ukrainian since the 16th century.⁷⁶ Third, more often than not, the inceptive verb in the PC could be used both with imperfectives and perfectives. Particularly rich evidence is found in charters written in the medieval Moldavian state of Stefan the Great (1457–1504).

The historical use of perfectives in the de-inceptive PC looks motley in the light of the morphological overlapping of the verbs *iměti* ‘to have’ and *jati* (*imati*) ‘to take’ as exemplified, for instance, in the homonymic *imutʹ* (3PL) from both *iměti* and *jati* (*imati*). The two also tended to coalesce semantically, thus extending their contexts as a prerequisite of their plausible convergent grammaticalization. In general,

usian dialects, hypothesized that this type of future tense was being replaced at that time by the PF *budu* + INF. As an illustration, he cited a peculiar formation *budu* (be-1SG) *xodzicimo* (walk-FUT.AUX.1PL) comprised of the auxiliary *budu* in combination with a de-inceptive future form. Clearly, the two futures were used concurrently in some Belarusian dialects. Moreover, the de-inceptive future tended to disappear since one deals here with the fossilized but not yet completely eroded phonological form of *xodzicimo* which, in this morphosyntactic environment, could potentially be uninflected (degrammatized).

74 Bevzenko et al., *Istorija ukrajins’koji movy. Morfolohija*, pp. 328–329.

75 Vyxovanec’ and Horodens’ka, *Teoretyčna morfolohija ukrajins’koji movy*, p. 254.

76 I. H. Matvijas et al., eds., *Atlas ukrajins’koji movy*, vol. 1: *Polissja, Srednja Naddniprovanščyna i sumišni zemli* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1984), map 263, vol.: 2: *Volyn, Naddnistrjanščyna i sumišni zemli* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1988), map 244.

the de-inceptive PC, retaining its primary semantics, demonstrated in the 15th century a weak grammaticalization of the auxiliary, whence concurrent interpretation of such constructions as de-obligative or ‘futuristic’:

- (6) MUkr. *a u kotoromъ torhu imutъ*
 and in which-LOC.SG.M market-LOC.SG.M have / take-3PL.PRES
ix kupiti tamъ imutъ dati [...]
 them buy-INF.PRf there have / take-3PL.PRES give-
 INF.PRf
*po četyry hroši (15th c.)*⁷⁷
 by four *grosh*-DAT.SG.M
 ‘And in which market they will buy them [horses], they have
 to / will pay four *groshes*’

The next grammaticalization round was heralded by the postposition of the auxiliary clitic that had been used as a free form until the 15th century. First examples of the *i*-less auxiliary in the postposed position are found in Moldavian charters extant from the mid-15th century. One of the first attestations of its concatenation with the infinitive in West Ukrainian dates to the mid-16th c.:

- (7) MUkr. *ne nadevatymet’*
 not hope-3SG.FUT
 ‘He / she will not hope’⁷⁸

While indirectly reflecting further grammaticalization of the postposed auxiliary clitic, this type of spelling reached Southeast Ukrainian much later. Suffice it to say that forms with the concatenated clitic are not yet found in the Poltava town records of the second half of the 17th century.⁷⁹ In sum, the so-called SF looks to be a relatively new formation

77 Mihai Costăchescu, ed., *Documentele moldovenești înainte de Ștefan cel Mare*, vol. 2 (Iași: Viața Romaneasca, 1932), p. 631.

78 Ivan Ohijenko, *Ukrajins’ka literaturna mova XVI-ho st. i Krevivs’kyj Apostol 1560-x r.* (Varšava: Drukarnja synodal’na, 1930), p. 386.

79 Kernyc’kyj, *Systema slovozmyny v ukrajins’kij movi*, p. 234.

that was originally attested in the southeast and somewhat later in the northeast of the Ukrainian-language speaking territories.

7. The Formation of the SF in Ukrainian

To ascertain the morphosyntactic nature of the Ukrainian SF as a de-inceptive PC with the concatenated auxiliary clitic, one should again stress whether the emergence of the *i*-less form of *jati* ‘to take’ was a result of phonetic erosion taking place after its concatenation (agglutination) with the infinitive or before. Most scholars seem to embrace the first scenario supporting the transformation of the inceptive *jati* into a Wackernagel form enclitic with a concurrent loss of the initial *i*.⁸⁰ I claimed elsewhere that the phonetic erosion of the inflected enclitic was hardly provoked by its further grammaticalization as exemplified by its concatenation with the infinitive.⁸¹

7-1. Phonetic shaping of ‘take’

The loss of the initial *i*- was rather an independent development, which could ultimately strengthen the desemantization of the verb *jati* used as an enclitic. The loss of *i* could have taken place as early as the late 13th century, becoming customary already in the ensuing century. Initially, the unstressed initial *i*- was dropped in the verb *iměti* ‘to have’ and in the preposition *iz ~ z (s)* ‘with’ only. Scantly attested in Middle Russian, examples of the said change were particularly numer-

80 Bevzenko, “Formy vyjavu majbytnjoji diji,” p. 215. Many scholars believe that the phonetic erosion of the auxiliary happened after it turned into an enclitic. The first mechanistic explanation was offered by Pavlo Žytec’kyj, *Narys literaturnoji istoriji ukrajins’koji movy v XVII v.* (L’viv: Ukrajins’ke vydavnytstvo, 1941), p. 108, who posited contraction of two vowels in the place of concatenation of the enclitic with the preceding infinitive, i.e., *xodyty + ym-u > xodyty-m-u* ‘I shall go.’ Similarly, Roland Sussex and Paul Cubberley, *The Slavic Languages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 288, argue that the two *i*’s are being contracted in the formation of the simplex form (SF).

81 Danylenko, “Naskil’ky ukrajins’kyj syntetyčnyj majbutnij čas je syntetyčnym?”

ous in Southwest Ukrainian (and Belarusian) in the early 14th century and later.⁸² Not influenced by the loss of *jers*, that was rather a contextually motivated analogical process which, spreading from the west, subsequently involved the morphologically innovative form *imati* ‘to take,’ whence not only *měti* : *matъ* ‘to have’ (MoUkr. *maty* ‘to have’ and ‘to have to’) but also *mati* : *mu* ‘to take.’⁸³ The former can be used as a lexical verb or its grammaticalized extension with perfectives and imperfectives in de-modal PCs:

- (8a) MoUkr. *ja maju* *budynok*
 I have-1SG.PRES house-ACC.SG.M
 ‘I have a house’
- (8b) *ja maju* *bihty*
 I have:to-1SG.PRES run-INF.IPRF
 ‘I have to hurry up’

7-2. *Dialect Evidence*

The overall picture of dialect reflexes of the de-inceptive future in Ukrainian is most revealing and is likely to furnish decisive arguments for our discussion. In Southwest Ukrainian (e.g., Pokuttja, Bukovyna, Transcarpathian, and Hucul dialects), the PF with the *i*-less form of the auxiliary occurs predominantly in non-parallel use.⁸⁴ In archaic Central Transcarpathian dialects, this future is attested alongside with the PF *budu* + INF, e.g., *mu spivaty* next to *budu spivaty* ‘I shall sing.’ Yet, what is remarkable about the western Ukrainian PF is that the auxiliary clitic ‘to take’ occur today in clause second or verb-adjacent position.⁸⁵

- (9a) SWUkr. *mu* *braty*
 FUT.AUX.1SG take-INF.IPRF

82 M. A. Žovtobrjux et al., *Istorija ukrajins'koji movy. Fonetyka* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1979), p. 302.

83 Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language*, p. 271.

84 Matvijas et al., eds., *Atlas ukrajins'koji movy*, vol. 2, map. 244.

85 F. T. Žylko, *Narysy z dialektolohiji ukrajins'koji movy* (Kyiv: Radjans'ka škola, 1966), pp. 101, 187.

presented below is likely to look chronologically fuzzy which nevertheless allows us to follow the inner logic of the concatenation of the clitic auxiliary with the infinitive in the de-inceptive PC in Ukrainian. The observations made above also suggest that we are hardly dealing in this case with contact-induced grammaticalization which might appear from the dialectal distribution. Otherwise, it would be difficult to explain why the transfer of a grammaticalization process from Southwest Ukrainian to the ‘replica Southeast Ukrainian’ exhibited a more advanced stage of grammaticalization.⁸⁸

	Innovations/stages	SWUkr.	NUkr.	SEUkr./ MoUkr
13th c.	emergence of <i>i</i> -less forms of the lexical verbs: <i>měti</i> : <i>mamъ</i> ‘to have’ and <i>mati</i> : <i>mu</i> ‘to take’	+	(+)	
14th c.	use of the de-inceptive PC with a free auxiliary: <i>imu</i> (take-1SG.FUT) + INF.IPRF/PRF	+	(+)	
15th c.	use of the de-inceptive PC with the auxiliary clitic in clause second position: <i>mu</i> (take-1SG.FUT) + INF.IPRF/PRF	+	+	
16th c.	use of the de-inceptive PC with the auxiliary clitic in verb-adjacent position: INF.IPRF + <i>mu</i> (take-1SG.FUT)		+	(+)
17th c.	emergence of the SF with the auxiliary clitic agglutinated with the infinitive: INF.IMPF- <i>mu</i>		(+)	+

7-3. *Morphosyntactic Integration of the Inceptive Auxiliary*

What is left to clarify is the functional status of the SF in Southeast Ukrainian (resp. modern Ukrainian) where it is claimed to be parallel with the PF of the type *budu* + INF, although some stylistic differences

⁸⁸ Cf. Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva, *The Changing Languages of Europe* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 185.

are posited for these forms.⁸⁹ Somewhat disconcertingly, Sussex and Cubberley reiterated that the simplex imperfective future (SF) is more common than the complex one of *budu* + INF.⁹⁰ However, Bevzenko recently argued that a real difference between the two future tense forms in Southeast Ukrainian (modern Ukrainian) reflected differences in the auxiliaries *budu* and *mu*.⁹¹ Somewhat earlier Křížková assumed that the inceptive meaning of the auxiliary in the SF tends to be discerned primarily in the dialects and vernacular.⁹² Dialectal data shows that the inceptive semantics of the inflected clitic *mu* has been retained not only in the most archaic southwestern but also in the newest southeastern dialects.

To determine the level of grammaticalization (grammation) of the inceptive auxiliary ‘to take’ both from the areal and diachronic points of view, it is useful to posit a specific clitic continuum, undergoing subsequent ranking of inceptiveness in Southwest Ukrainian (with the auxiliary clitic in clause second or verb-adjacent position) via some northern (Polissian) dialects to Southeast Ukrainian (with the auxiliary clitic concatenated with the infinitive). Despite the concatenation of the auxiliary in Southeast Ukrainian, one can speak, in terms of morphosyntactic change, only about a minimal bond strengthening of this auxiliary in the SF, which can hardly be compared with the bond strengthening typical of the Serbian future: *hoć-u pisati* ‘I want to write’ > *pisati=hć-u* FUT > *piša=ć-u* 1SG.FUT, that is, word > inflected enclitic > suffix.⁹³

There is no segmental univerbation of the auxiliary concatenated with the infinitive in southeastern and some northern dialects: no expression reduction (erosion) is observed at the morpheme boundary between the infinitive and the auxiliary clitic in verb-adjacent position. Even if the auxiliary is concatenated with the infinitive as is the case in Southeast

89 Vyxovanec’ and Horodens’ka, *Teoretyčna morfolohija ukrajins’koji movy*, p. 254.

90 Sussex and Cubberley, *The Slavic Languages*, p. 288.

91 Bevzenko, “Formy vyjavu majbytnjoji diji,” p. 216.

92 Křížková, *Vývoj opisného futura*, p. 129.

93 Henning Andersen, “Grammaticalization in a Speaker-oriented Theory of Change,” in Eythórsson, ed., *Grammatical Change and Linguistic Theory*, pp. 11–44 (p. 27).

and North Ukrainian, it does not appear either semantically or morpho-syntactically fully integrated with the host. Taken areal-typologically, the process of grammation seems to have stopped short of transforming the inflected Wackernagel clitic into true person-and-number markers in Southeast Ukrainian.⁹⁴

8. Conclusions

Overall, the Ukrainian SF is morphosyntactically premised on a clitic continuum for the future-marking auxiliary. There are no solid grounds for identifying the SF as inflectional since the inflectional principle applies to the auxiliary clitic only, which reveals its primary inceptive meaning. In the bulk of the Romance languages, however, the segmental univertation of the former auxiliary looks complete. According to Jurgen Klausenburger, the history of the Romance future has “run the course” on all four parameters (desemantization, decategorization, cliticization, and erosion) and that, therefore, it qualifies as a case of complete grammaticalization.⁹⁵

Remarkably, the Ukrainian and Romance future tense forms are derived from different types of paraphrases. The Romance future is based on the auxiliary *habere* used in the combination with the object and *praedicativum* as the channel of auxiliiation.⁹⁶ For the futurity, the latter form was superseded by the *gerundivum*, later to be replaced by the infinitive, indicating a posterior property of the object. The Ukrainian SF is derived from the East Slavic PC with the determined imperfective ‘to take’ serving as a de-inceptive auxiliary. Along with other de-inceptive constructions, for instance, with auxiliaries in *-čati* ‘to begin,’ inherited from the late Common Slavic and attested in North Russian, the construction with the auxiliary ‘to take’ is solidly represented in Ukrainian and in some contiguous southern Belarusian dialects, and sporadically in

94 Danylenko, “Auxiliary Clitics in Southwest Ukrainian.”

95 Jurgen Klausenburger, *Grammaticalization. Studies in Latin and Romance Morphosyntax* (Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000), p. 77.

96 Pinkster, “The Strategy and Chronology of the Development,” p. 210.

outlying dialects of the Russian north.⁹⁷ In Ukrainian, while exhibiting various degrees of grammaticalization, this de-inceptive PC with a non-finite imperfective main verb is attested cross-dialectally and in modern Ukrainian. In Southwest Ukrainian, the de-inceptive type is less grammaticalized and does not necessarily occur in parallel use with the PF *budu* + INF or *budu* + *l*-FORM. In Southeast Ukrainian, the de-inceptive PC is more grammaticalized, although the auxiliary clitic is not fully integrated with the host.

An analogy, nevertheless, can be drawn between the future in Romance and de-obligative constructions in Ukrainian, both derived from the de-modal extension of ‘to have.’ In Romance, the latter was used as an auxiliary in paraphrases with both retrospective (Romance perfect) and prospective aspect (Romance future). Identified sometimes as a Balkanism, a similar de-modal auxiliary was copiously attested in Old Church Slavonic, as well as later in the Russian recension of Church Slavonic due to the second South Slavic influence. In Ukrainian, however, the de-obligative paraphrase with the de-modal extension ‘to have to’ seems to be an independent development exhibiting no grammation of the auxiliary.

To sum up, the Ukrainian de-inceptive SF, and its underlying East Slavic periphrastic construction, has nothing to share with the Romance future either typologically or genetically.

97 Andersen, “Periphrastic Futures in Slavic,” pp. 9–45 (p. 30).