

Introduction

Irina Nevskaya

1. Beginnings

The present volume is a result of cooperation between scholars dealing with various linguistic families on the territory of Northern and Central Eurasia in research on the categories of Prospective and Proximative. These categories are described here for the first time for most treated languages.

This volume has its prehistory. Being a Humboldt Foundation fellow in Mainz, I was working on a description of infinitive constructions consisting of a lexical verb in the infinitive form and an auxiliary verb of intention, position in space or existence and referring to different stages of an action before its starting point in South Siberian Turkic languages with Prof. Maja Chermisina in 1988-1989 (CHERMISINA / NEVSKAYA 2000). Most constructions of the type I was interested in have modal semantics of intention and willingness to fulfil an action with an animate subject: ‘he or she wants / wishes/ intends / plans / gets ready to do something’. However, constructions with positional and existential auxiliaries express rather a state of affairs when an impending action is already relevant for the speaker; their categorial semantics could be described as ‘be going / about to do something’. The fact that they do not express intention is especially obvious when the subject is inanimate:

Altai *Qazan emdi le qayn-arya tur-d-ı*
Qazan now PRTCL boil-INF stand:AUX-PST-3
‘The meal (lit.: the qazan, i.e. a kind of a pot) is just about to boil’.

It occurred to me that such constructions are a highly grammaticalized means of expressing the category defined by Bernard COMRIE as Prospective (1976). COMRIE 1976 predicts the existence of such a linguistic category opposed to the category of Perfect, which, in his framework, refers to an event that has taken place earlier, but is still relevant to the speaker in the moment of speaking. Thus, Prospective would refer to an event already relevant to the speaker in the moment of speaking although it has not yet taken place.

Constructions with similar semantics in various Turkic languages have continued to be of interest to me. I found that there were no descriptions of them in grammars of Turkic languages, so information on them had to be collected in personal interviews and field research trips. The material was published in NEVSKAYA 2005, which was the first attempt to outline a typology of Turkic means with the prototypical semantics ‘be going / about to do something’. In 2012, I organized a workshop “Prospective in Turkic languages” (in cooperation with Lars JOHANSON, Marcel ERDAL, Saule TAZHIBAYEVA, Astrid MENZ, Monika RIND-PAWLOWSKI and Amine MEMENTIMIN) in the framework of the *International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. This workshop marked the beginning of a more

systematic research on this category in Turkic languages (see the proceedings: ZEYREK et al. 2015). Subsequent discussions of the category “pre-stage of an event already relevant to the moment of speaking” with colleagues at the Institute of Empirical Linguistics, Frankfurt University, especially with Agnes KORN, led to the workshop organized by the two of us in September of 2013.¹ It aimed at describing Turkic and Iranian means expressing this semantics in the first place, and at establishing this category in a number of further languages spoken in Eurasia that are in contact with Turkic and Iranian languages in order to explore the areal distribution of this category. This volume presents the proceedings of the symposium with a few additional articles.

2. The terms “Prospective” and “Proximative”

Prospective and Proximative are disputable concepts in typology. The term “Prospective” is used differently in the various linguistic traditions: METZLER’s dictionary of linguistic terms understands Prospective as the future aspect meaning of present tense forms of Russian perfective verbs such as *ja ujdu* ‘I will go away’. Similar to this, Lars JOHANSON (1975, 1994, 2000) opposes Prospective to interterminal, adterminal and postterminal aspects and defines the Turkish form in *-acak*, mostly characterized as a future tense in Turkish grammar books, as Prospective. He states that it expresses a predicted event that will / can / might take place after the *reference time*: “Prospective is a perspective on events foreseen to occur subsequent to some temporal orientation point (‘reference time’). Future reference is largely a matter of modality ... ‘shall, will occur, is going to occur, is supposed, expected, or requested to occur’, e.g. Turkish *gid-ecek* ‘X will go’” (JOHANSON, this volume). He admits that such forms have not yet become “straight” future temporal forms in most Turkic languages and express a cluster of prospected action semantics and modality. In contrast, COMRIE 1976 uses the term Prospective for patterns with the prototypical semantics ‘be going/about to do something’ and referring to a state of affairs when the signs of an impending situation are already obvious at the moment of speaking.

On the other hand, linguistic means referring to the pre-stage of the action and expressing the prototypical semantics ‘be going/about to do something’ have received different terminology in typology:

- Prospective (e.g. COMRIE 1976; PLUNGYAN 2001, 2011, 2012);
- immediate / imminent future, near / nearest future, close future (BYBEE 1994);
- Proximative (HEINE 1994; HEINE / KUTEVA 2002; JOHANSON, this volume).

According to Lars JOHANSON (this volume), “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.” On top of this, the term “Proximative”, also used in spatial deixis with reference to spatial areas close to the orientation centre, is transferred onto temporal relations where it denotes close temporal distance between the temporal orientation point and another event that has either already taken place, or is close to happening (see ERDAL, this volume). Thus, there are two different conceptual categories

¹ I am deeply obliged to my dear colleague and co-editor of this volume Agnes KORN, who has contributed to its present form in an invaluable way by her scientific expertise, persistence and a very friendly support and patience.

with contradicting terminology. At present, the usage of the term “Prospective” is preferred for the category of “pre-stage of an action already relevant for the orientation point” in the American and Russian typological traditions (cf. COMRIE 1976 and PLUNGYAN 2001, 2011, 2012) while German typologists use the term “Proximative” (see JOHANSON, this volume).

Although the literal meaning of the word “Proximative” suggests temporal closeness between an action and its pre-stage, these are not necessarily very close in time in reality: *I am going to do something*, a prototypical proximative context, does not have any indication to close implementation of the envisaged action. In fact, the action might never happen. Avertive forms have exactly these semantics: an action that was about to take place, but was averted from happening (KUTEVA 1998, 2001). Taking into consideration the duality of the terminology, we will use the term “Proximative/Prospective” (or just “Proximative”), both for the conceptual category “pre-stage of an action already relevant in the temporal orientation point” and for respective forms with the prototypical meaning “be going/about to do something”, and the term “Prospective/Future” (or just “Prospective”) for the aspect-tense category and respective forms with future reference.

We encouraged the contributors to this volume to use the terminology proposed by JOHANSON (this volume). However, the already established traditions just mentioned were sometimes stronger, and some authors felt that, for the language they discuss, another approach would be more appropriate. Consequently, we chose to allow authors to make their choices and give a short explanation of the terminology used in their articles. Although the category of Proximative/Prospective was in the focus of attention at the Frankfurt symposium in 2013, the Prospective/Future category was also treated in many contributions. This is a logical consequence of the following two facts: 1) the clusters of proximative/prospective and prospective/future semantics are expressed by a number of forms in the treated languages synchronically, or 2) sometimes a historical development of proximative forms into prospective ones can be supposed, see Section 4.

3. Proximative/Prospective as a cross-linguistic category: state of research

As a cross-linguistic phenomenon, the category of Proximative/Prospective has attracted the attention of general linguists about forty years ago. At first, Bernard COMRIE 1976 put forward a hypothesis of existence of a grammatical category symmetrical to Perfect. Later, typological investigations carried out by Östen DAHL (1985) and Joan BYBEE (1994: 271-273) found evidence for postulating a cross-linguistic category.

According to Östen DAHL (1985), “A formally and semantically analogous construction to the English one [i.e. *going to do*] 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.” Joan BYBEE (1994: 271-273) described 26 grams (grammatical morphemes) expressing Proximative/Prospective (in her terminology “immediate future”); for 19 of them, it is their only function.

Further evidence from languages of different typology has contributed to advances in investigating this category. Thus, KUTEVA’s research on African languages (1998) showed

that these possess a grammatical category of Avertive referring to an impending event that was prevented from happening, which can be considered as one subtype of the Proximative.² Research on Jukagir forms with Proximative/Prospective semantics (MASLOVA 2004) resulted in distinguishing two semantic types: 1) the intentional one, roughly corresponding to *be going/about to do something*, and 2) the providential one which roughly corresponds to *be marked to*, as in Shakespearean *If we are marked to die ...*

As already mentioned, NEVSKAYA 2005 gave a preliminary description of proximative / prospective means and main sources of their development for Turkic. These are as follows:

1) actional constructions with infinitives of the lexical verb and various auxiliaries inflected for tense-aspect-mood, person and number; some of them get synthesized, lose tense markers and function as finite proximative forms or near futures;

2) constructions of direct speech with volitive forms of the lexical verb.

NEVSKAYA 2015 added the third source for proximative/prospective forms:

3) synthetic intraterminal aspect forms of low focality (mainly participles) that tend to develop into proximative/prospective forms and, finally, into prospectives/futures.³

4. Prospective/Future and Proximative/Prospective overlapping

Prospective/Future language means can express proximative/prospective semantics (see e.g. KARAKOÇ, this volume) while proximative means are often defined as “futures” or “near futures” in grammar books. The diversity of Turkic prospective forms and the fact that Turkic languages do not share future formations allow formulating the following hypothesis:

In aspect languages such as Turkic where tense is secondary, futures are young if they exist at all. In their development, Turkic futures might have passed through the stages of Proximative/Prospective and Prospective.

As NEVSKAYA 2015 stated, Turkic synthetic intraterminal aspect forms of low focality roughly corresponding to MASLOVA’s forms with providential semantics have regularly developed into prospective and future tense forms in Turkic languages. Thus, the all-Turkic aorist *-(V)r*, an intraterminal form of low focality, has become a future tense in South Siberian Turkic.⁴

Astrid MENZ 2015 describes proximative/prospective means and their correlation with future and intentional forms in two representatives of Oghuz Turkic – Turkish and Gagauz. According to her research, both Turkish and Gagauz have no specialized grammatical item that serves exclusively to express general proximative/prospective semantics. Instead, it “...is mainly conveyed by *-(y)acak*” (MENZ 2015). Is this a proof that the two categories have merged in these varieties and that presumably originally purely proximative *-(y)acak* has developed into Prospective here?

² For further descriptions of this category in languages of different systems see PLUNGYAN 2012.

³ See also NEVSKAYA / ŠALAMAJ (2009) on Shor intraterminal forms and ways of their development and NEVSKAYA 2015 on not specialized forms that might have proximative semantics in Turkic languages.

⁴ See also CSATÓ (this volume) on the Karaim “straight”, i.e. “non-modal future form” that has developed from the all-Turkic aorist *-(V)r*.

It is also remarkable that the Turkish aorist form *-(V)r* regularly gives prospective readings in contexts when speakers want to express a high degree of certainty of their prediction, e.g. *Öl-ür-sün* ‘You will / are [surely] going to die [if you eat these mushrooms]’. The certainty of this unfortunate prediction is based on the experience of the speaker: *every person who eats these mushrooms dies > s/he is bound to die > s/he will die*, which could be the way how the aorist form has developed its future functions in Siberian Turkic and some other Turkic languages (MENZ 2015). This overlapping is not incidental; it is based on the semantic overlapping of these categories: referring to the pre-stage of a situation: we infer its coming into existence in case the present state persists and nothing averts it.

In spite of advances in research on the Proximative/Prospective in Turkic languages, there are many disputable questions relevant for Turkic languages and beyond:

- The status of this category in each concrete language: Is it aspect, tense, mood, Aktionsart, or modality?
- Prospective versus Proximative, their specificity and interrelations.
- How is it connected with the categories of Potentiality, Future, Intention?
- What are the semantic and formal types of prospective and proximative means in a concrete language?
- What is the role of areal convergence of genetically related and non-related languages for developing respective categories?

Some of these issues are dealt with in this volume.

We have often referred to Turkic languages. This is because they have, probably, the most grammaticalized proximative language means, including synthetic finite forms, mostly going back to infinitive constructions or intraterminal aspect forms of low focality. It is remarkable that these forms had not been described in terms of a specific category much prior to our research. My guess is that descriptions of Turkic languages spoken in the Soviet Union were largely oriented on descriptions of Russian and, broader, Indo-European languages. Since Russian does not have a grammatical category of Proximative, it remained unnoticed also by Soviet Turcologists. As for Turkish, where Russian influence on its grammar description can be excluded, it differs from the majority of Turkic languages in that it has only an actional form with the postposition *iizere* ‘on’ as the most grammaticalized analytical morphological strategy of its encoding.

For the other language families treated in this volume, it is practically one of the first descriptions of these categories if not the first one.

5. Advances in research on Prospective and Proximative in the present volume

This volume begins with three introductory articles detailing the context of the studies on the individual languages. In the main parts of this book, the reader will find two types of articles: more in-depth analysis articles and shorter case studies arranged geographically: Prospective and Proximative in languages spoken in Southern Europe, the Caucasus, Central Asia, Siberia and China. Languages of various families are spoken in close contacts to Turkic and Iranian languages on the vast territory of Northern and Central Eurasia,

providing rich examples of areal convergence of genetically related and non-related languages in the spheres of Prospective and Proximative. Although Iranian and Turkic (and in general Altaic) languages are in the focus of the present volume, material on other languages of Eurasia give an important areal perspective on these categories along with valuable material for their semantic and formal typology.

We will first address some significant results of research on Proximative and Prospective presented in the articles on non-Altaic and non-Iranian languages before analyzing new advances in research on these categories in Altaic. In doing so, we will refer to typological, areal and historical issues from the perspective of the new data presented in this volume.⁵

5.1 Non-Altaic languages

Representing non-Altaic languages, this volume features articles on languages spoken in the North of Eurasia: Ugric (Khanty), Uralic (Tundra Nenets, Kamas and Mator, two extinct Sayan Samoyed languages), Slavic (Russian), and in the central parts of Eurasia, namely in North Western Iran, Northern Iraq and South Eastern Turkey (North Eastern Neo-Aramaic).

The article by Natalja KOSHKAREVA is a comparative-typological study of Khanty and Russian proximative means. These two languages lack any morphological proximatives. They both use particles with very characteristic clusters of meanings: proximative, aspectual and pragmatic ones in Khanty and proximative and modal in Russian. In particular, in Khanty, the particle *śi / ċi* ‘right now, soon’ is a marker of both aspect and topic-comment structure. It may be viewed as aspectual, marking the external borders of the action in the near future and past, relevant to the moment of speech; its function of marking relevance activates the additional focal nature of the event. The corresponding Russian adverb *vot-vot* ‘about to’ is connected to potential modality, which is additionally marked by combining exclusively with perfective verbs in future tense meaning.

Natalja KOSHKAREVA concludes that proximativity in Russian is not grammaticalized; there is, however, a range of multilevel means that are available to express this meaning; they are still to be described and systematized. Nevertheless, the system has the same features as in languages where this semantics is expressed via specific grammatical forms, namely: the symmetry of the Proximative and the Perfect, the relations to the terminal points of an event; the relevance to the reference point of the utterance. The pragmatic markedness of proximative language means highlighted in KOSHKAREVA’s article is a feature that should be investigated in more detail in further research.

Svetlana BURKOVA describes two participle⁶ forms used in Tundra Nenets, a Uralic language, to convey prospective semantics. The Prospective is not an independent grammatical category in Nenets. Its values are distributed between the grammatical

⁵ We will not analyze here articles on Iranian languages, as this is done in detail in the article of Agnes KORN (this volume).

⁶ The term “participle” is used by the author to refer to polifunctional verb forms that can be used as finite and non-finite predicates.

categories of aspect and evidentiality, thus presenting another semantic cluster expressed by forms with prospective semantics. In non-finite predication, the Prospective is integrated into the system of aspectual grams encoded by participles. Here, prospective formations refer to a situation anticipated for some later point in time judging by the state of affairs observed at an earlier point. In the finite function, the evidentials *-mänta* and *-p̄tsu* are opposed as forms expressing “sensory evidential prospective” and “mental evidential prospective”, respectively. Both meanings include a prediction about a future situation on the basis of what information the speaker has at the moment of speech or at another reference point. In the case of the “sensory evidential prospective”, such information is presented by the speaker’s direct perception of a preliminary phase of a situation which is going to happen. In the case of the “mental evidential prospective”, the speaker predicts a situation on the basis of his/her knowledge about some circumstances external to this situation which may cause it to happen.

The contribution by Gerson KLUMPP discusses readings in terms of proximativity for a handful of examples from the sources of the only documented Sayan Samoyed languages Kamas and Mator that are extinct now. The available data show close parallels to Turkic biverbal actional constructions with auxiliary verbs bearing the tense-aspect-modus and person morphology and lexical verbs in a converb or infinitive form. However, proximative constructions of the Turkic type are not attested here. Proximative interpretations are plausible for contexts with some aspectual grammemes, namely with progressive ones. These meanings are the result of an interaction of verbal actional properties with an aspect operator: achievement verbs (or telic punctual verbs) such as, e.g., ‘die’, ‘fall asleep’, or ‘extinguish’ only have a weakly conceptualized pre-phase or none at all, i.e. they denote a point of transformation, but not a process leading to the point of transformation as is the case with accomplishment verbs such as ‘erect (a building)’. Thus, only achievement verbs allow for proximative interpretations. The second source of proximatives are intentional predicates. Used with inanimate subjects, they can only be characterized as proximative ones. With animate subjects, a proximative interpretation is not always plausible.

The author further discusses the semantic structure of Proximative not in terms of aspect or tense, but in terms of inference. In his opinion, in the context of an intentional predicate ‘The weather becomes warm (lit.: wants to become warm)’, the proximative reading is the result of the inferential use of the intentional construction. This means that the speaker expects, infers, on the base of the present weather situation, that the weather will be changing rather soon towards being warm. The question whether the proximative readings of the progressive achievement constructions are also to be considered inferential is likewise answered positively: “First, their encoding as progressives signals an ongoing state of affairs at the moment of reference. Second, the punctuality semantics of the relevant verbs demands an understanding that the point of transformation has not occurred yet.” The proximative semantics of progressives then is a result of inference of a subsequent state. It mirrors the inferential perfect where, based on an observable state of affairs at the time of speech, a situation in the past is inferred. Thus, we again arrive at the semantic symmetry of Proximative and Perfect. The fact that an inferential component is a part of the semantics of proximative forms is obvious. However, we do not assume that this is their most dominant semantic feature in all languages. Nevertheless, it is worth trying to look at forms

expressing proximative semantics in non-proximative languages (i.e. in languages without specialized proximative forms) under this angle: Are there languages that have forms expressing the semantic cluster of inference and proximity as their core semantics?

Paul NOORLANDER's article deals with Proximative and its correlates in North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic. The most diverse group of Eastern Neo-Aramaic, with about 150 dialects, North Eastern Neo-Aramaic (NENA), is spoken by Jewish and Christian communities in North Western Iran, Northern Iraq and South Eastern Turkey. Most Eastern Neo-Aramaic speakers are either Aramaic-Kurdish or Aramaic-Arabic bilinguals and have lived in an area with a long history of multilingualism. Their dialects have been shaped not only by Kurdish, but also by neighboring languages (Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Azeri). The author gives a comparative yet not exhaustive overview of the manifold constructions that (can) convey proximative meaning in these dialects. He postulates that the NENA future participle and the future prefix have developed from auxiliary verbs with the semantics 'want' through the stage of a proximative auxiliary construction, a development that is proven by historical sources. The grammaticalization of 'want, need' into a proximative auxiliary is found across languages of the world. For example, a future particle derived from a fossilized form of the verb 'want' deprived of person agreement marking is a known trait of the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund, such as Greek *tha* (< *thelei hina* 'it will be that' < '(s)he wants that', PAPPAS / JOSEPH 2001) and Bulgarian *šte* (< 'he wants'; HEINE / KUTEVA 2002: 311) alongside Early Ottoman Future (ERDAL 1995). Also here, the focus adverbs play an important role in creating proximative contexts: "Deictic adverbials like English *now* modify the focus of a verb form to the immediate present. The combination of the future and the adverb *hadiyya* 'now' (or a dialectal variant) can convey an immediate proximative meaning."

Some progressive constructions in NENA dialects are closely connected to the Proximative. They are primarily composed of the (enclitic) copula and a non-finite verbal element. This can be the infinitive preceded by the preposition with the semantics 'in', or 'on'. The Proximative is also connected to the Progressive with respect to telicity. Generally, telic intransitive verbs such as 'come' can have an inchoative sense in the Progressive, which would approximate the meaning of a Proximative, since the result is still pending. As a conclusion the author notes that the Proximative occupies a prominent place in the NENA aspect system. It does not only interact and correlate with the future tense and progressive constructions. Also the Preterite or the Perfect, Irrealis moods such as the Subjunctive and other conceptualizations of time and imminence or immediacy, involving both finite and non-finite verbal morphology serve as proximative expressions.

5.2 Altaic languages

Altaic languages are represented here by a Tungusic language, Even, a Mongolian language, Eastern Yughur, and a number of Turkic languages belonging to different branches of Turkic: South-Western or Oghuz (Turkish, Northern and Southern Azeri), North-Western or Kipchak (Noghay, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Karaim), North-Eastern or Siberian (Tuvan, Dzungar Tuvan, Altai and its dialects), and South-Eastern (Modern Uyghur and Uzbek). In addition, the article by Marcel ERDAL deals with historic Turkic sources

presenting proximative material. Astrid MENZ contrasts prospective and proximative categories in different historical stages of Turkish: in Ottoman and Modern Turkish.

Dejan MATIĆ analyses the semantic structure of proximative forms as consisting to different degrees of aspect, tense and mood components, which is a very interesting and promising idea for further research on this category. The paper aims to determine to what extent these semantic components are represented in the meaning of the proximatives in Even, a North Tungusic language closely related to Evenki and Negidal, all spoken by small reindeer herding communities scattered over a huge area in north-eastern Siberia. MATIĆ's analysis shows that two forms function as proximatives in Even; both are periphrastic constructions with a purposive converb in combination with 'do' and 'be' as the auxiliary verbs. It is remarkable that we find structural parallels to both forms in Shor and Khakas (along with Yakut), and to the second one in Southern Altai. Especially the proximative construction with the verb 'do' in two Turkic languages belonging to the Ob-Yenisei sub-branch of South Siberian Turkic languages could be suggestive of former close contacts between this sub-branch and Tungusic languages.

Hans NUGTEREN gives a profound description of a proximative Eastern Yugur form *-la*: with a short overview of Mongolian strategies of encoding proximative semantics and shows their closeness in Mongolian and Turkic languages. The form *-la*: has a variety of functions in different Mongolic languages. BINNICK (2012: 215) states the following about *-la*:, which he analyses as an evidential form for spoken Khalkha: "The evidential ending is proximal; it serves to connect the eventuality (event or state) referred to in the sentence to the immediate speech act situation". Proximity in past or future seems to be an invariant of its semantics. In Eastern Yugur, it has become a specialized proximative marker. It developed from a "witnessed past" marker, apparently via a stage in which it was temporally ambiguous, as in modern Mongolian proper.

Marcel ERDAL describes Old Turkic proximative means. Echoing BINNICK's evaluation of *-la*:, he understands the term "Proximative" to be symmetrically oriented towards anteriority or towards posteriority. It can apply both to aspect and to actionality. Differently from the Mongolic form in question where both semantic types are encoded by historically the same item, Old Turkic has an anterior tense form of recent past *-yUk* (ERDAL 2004: 266-268). Symmetrically, posterior proximity of an impending event is expressed by various means: derivational, inflectional and syntactic ones, most of which can be found in modern Turkic languages. This shows that the category of Proximative was already present in Old Turkic. It is found in all Old Turkic corpora, embracing a period of over six centuries. Interestingly, the famous medieval Turcologist KĀŞĠARĪ gave the first description of this category in various Old Turkic varieties, even if he did not apply the term "Proximative". The article focuses on proximative language means, their semantics and the sources of their development in all documented Old Turkic varieties. It is evident from the data that Old Turkic varieties distinguished providential and intentional types of proximative/prospective semantics, *-sXk* being a marker of providential proximatives: *öl-sük-ün* 'you are bound to die', while *-gU är-* and *-(X)glI* served as intentional proximatives: *maña käligli turur* 'He intends and has in mind coming to me'. The temporal distance to the

envisaged event could be unspecified (with *-sXk* and *-(X)gII*), or it could be very short, with *-gAllr*, a synthetic finite proximative form: *kün uyaq-γalır* ‘the sun is about to set’.

Astrid MENZ describes Ottoman and Modern Turkish prospective and proximative means. She states that neither variety makes use of a special form or construction to express exclusively general prospectivity. The suffix coming next to expressing just an anticipated future tense is probably the shortly lived marker *-(y)IsAr*, expressing prediction with almost no modal shades of intention, wish or volition. In both varieties of West Oghuz Turkic, general prospectivity has mainly but not exclusively been covered by the prospective marker *-(y)AcAk* over the course of some 600 years, also conveying semantic nuances of intention and prediction. In Ottoman and Modern Turkish, proximative semantics is not expressed by means of distinct aspecto-temporal markers or interpreted as inherent in a certain aspecto-temporal form. Rather analytical constructions with adverbs and postposition express this semantics. Thus, Turkish employs special constructions like a combination of the adverb *neredeyse* plus a predicate marked with *-(y)AcAk*, a prospective marker, or with aorist, the infinitive in *-mAk* with the postposition *üzere*, and a reduplicated predicate form. MENZ 2015 mentions further forms that can have proximative readings: the past tense *-DI*, the avertive form *-ayaz*. It is remarkable that *-DI* can express prospectivity when the action is on the verge of happening and is presented by the speaker as if it has already happened: *gittim* go-PST-1SG ‘I’m off’. A synthetic avertive form *-ayaz* (< the converb *-A + yaz-* ‘fail, err’) that was considered to be obsolete is reviving at present (Menz 2015). Still, the typical way to express Avertive in Turkish are adverbials like *az kaldı* or *az kalsın* and also *neredeyse* etc. in combination with either *-acaktı* or *-iyordu*.

Monika RIND-PAWLOWSKI describes future-related forms in Northern Azeri, the national language of the Republic of Azerbaijan. It differs from Southern Azeri, spoken in the Iranian provinces of East and West Azerbaijan, Ardebil, and Zanzan in showing lesser influence of Persian and an increasing influence of Russian during the Soviet period, and of Turkish and Western European languages since 1991 when Azerbaijan obtained its independence. Azeri has a number of prospectives / futures, as is typical for this area (see also SULEYMANOV, this volume). The formation *-(y)AcAQ* presents a future action as a fact to be. This form can also have proximative readings. The multi-functional aorist form *-(A)r* in its future-related usage expresses assumptivity, possibility, proposal, readiness, willingness. As for the category of Proximative, an analytical infinitive construction with the auxiliary verb ‘want’ renders proximative semantics when the subject is inanimate. Since there is a corresponding proximative construction in Persian with the verb ‘want’, with the same semantic restriction of an inanimate subject, it is plausible that this Azeri construction is a structural copy of the Persian one. Another Northern Azeri proximative form, *-mAk üzre*, could be a Turkish loan since it is not present in Southern Azeri. Non-specialized proximative forms conveying proximative semantics only in certain contexts are the present form in *-(y)Ir*, and the past tense *-D* – which is an almost universal feature in the languages of Eurasia treated here. As in Turkish, avertive semantics is expressed by the adverb *az* ‘little’ in combination with the verb *qal-* ‘remain’.

Adel RAFIEI’s article deals with Southern Azeri and Persian proximative forms in a comparative perspective. While Persian and Azeri belong to two different language

families, they have been in very close contact for centuries. These contacts are especially intensive for Southern Azeri in Iran in the situation of Azeri-Persian bilingualism of Azeri speakers. Persian has patterns employing *xāstan* ('to want'), *raftan* ('to go'), and the idiomatic construction *dar šorof-e* with the infinitive of the lexical verb and 'be' as auxiliary. In addition to these constructions, the present progressive with *dāštan* is used to convey proximative semantics. Azeri also has three periphrastic constructions as candidates for proximative forms: constructions with *istəmək* 'to want' and *getmək* 'to go', and a construction of converb with the negated infinitive. The present tense forms of some verbs can serve as proximatives, too. It seems obvious that the constructions with *istəmək* and *getmək* are calques of the respective Persian constructions: they do not only use auxiliary verbs with the same lexical semantics, but combine them with the subjunctive form of the lexical verb. Persian and Azeri share further language means which convey proximative semantics: the negated subjunctive, the past tense verb alongside an avertive construction formed by the auxiliary 'come' (*āmadan* in Persian and *gəlmək* in Azeri) and the subjunctive of the lexical verb, thus being even closer to each other than Northern and Southern Azeri as far as Proximative it concerned.

Birsel KARAKOÇ's paper describes prospective, proximative and avertive means in Noghay. It illustrates typical semantic clusters of non-focal intraterminal and prospective semantics (*-AdI (edi)*), of Prospective and Proximative (the combination of the focal prospective *-(A)yAK bol-* with the high-focal intraterminal form *-(I)p turī* specifically denotes proximativity); and of Prospective and Intention (*-(A)r (edi)*). The complex markers *-MAGA turī*, *-MAGA turyan(da)* and *-MAGA dep* consisting of the actional noun *-MA* in the dative in combination with the auxiliary *tur-* 'stand up, stand' or with the citation marker *dep* express proximativity in different syntactic positions. The forms *-MAGA tur-/dep* are structural correspondences to other Kipchak and South Siberian constructions with verbal nouns in combination with positional verbs as auxiliaries, or with the citation marker *dep*.

The article by Éva Á. CSATÓ describes the non-modal prospective aorist (which in Old Turkic was the present) and seeks an answer to the question how this verbal category has gained its non-modal prospective meaning in Karaim and became a "straight" future form. She argues for Russian contact influence: Future is expressed in Turkic languages by modal items while Russian is different in this respect as its future forms are not modal: "The development in Karaim is a result of selective copying of semantic/functional properties of Russian future forms. Since the Karaims have been speakers of Slavic languages for several centuries, their language is characterized by many features copied from Slavic. The habit to express the Russian type of 'future' has easily led to the habit to use the aorist as its functional equivalent."

Saule TAZHIBAeva and Irina NEVSKAYA describe the Kazakh and Kirghiz proximative forms (see also NEVSKAYA / TAZHIBAeva 2015). Kazakh and Kirghiz are rich in proximative morphology. Alongside lexical expressions, e.g. *az qaldı* 'little (time) remained (to an event)', both have specialized proximative means and primarily intentional and resultative means that express proximativity. Of the latter, the use of a resultative actional form *-(X)p qal-* in the past tense is especially remarkable. Proximative meaning is most regularly expressed by a primarily resultative construction if the subject denotes meals, drinks, food

in general, which are on the verge of transition to another state. These are gradual processes, so that the transition takes a certain period of time. Also in other contexts with resultatives used as proximatives (like a close approaching of summer vacations and the like), the imminent events are gradual processes or accomplishments, often with positive connotations (the speaker is looking forward to them as s/he anticipates them). These language means refer to situations when a process is approaching its end. Thus, here, not the whole situation is imminent, but its ending point which marks a transition into another state. Moreover, as we supposed in NEVSKAYA 2015, the semantic shift from resultative to proximative semantics could explain how Russian perfective verbs in the present tense have developed their prospective semantics and are now considered future tense forms. We can suppose that the prospective semantics of Russian perfective verbs was developed in a few steps: first by stems referring to certain stages of gradual actions and expressing proximative semantics of the anticipatory type, later it got generalized to all perfective verbs and further grammaticalized as Prospective. (Of course, this hypothesis should be checked on Russian historical sources.) Proximative proper forms in Kazakh are *-GAlI* with auxiliary verbs while Kirghiz has a corresponding actional form with the *-GANI* purposive converb also fulfilling infinitive functions. In these analytical forms, the choice of the auxiliary verb defines the temporal distance to the approaching action.

Aminem MEMTIMIN concentrates on semantic and pragmatic aspects of Modern Uyghur and Uzbek expressions for proximative content. Her data show that both languages have diverse language means that can be employed for expressing proximativity. Along with various lexical means and relational nouns in combination with verbal nouns of lexical verbs both in Uyghur and Uzbek, there is an Uyghur highly grammaticalized proximative form with the lexical verb in the form of the purpose converb *-Gili* plus auxiliary verbs *qil-* ‘do’, *tur-* ‘stand’, an *qop-* ‘get up’. These forms are very close to those found in Kazakh, Kirghiz, Siberian Turkic, and in Old Turkic. The Uyghur *-Gili* converb with the auxiliary *yat-* ‘lie’ has synthesized as a composite finite proximative marker *-Giliwati*, which has also happened to some analogous South Siberian proximative formations. The proximative form “*-Gili + qil-* ‘do’” has parallels in Shor, Khakas (NEVSKAYA 2005), Chalkan (NEVSKAYA 2011) as well as in other Altaic languages (see MATIĆ, this volume), and “*-Gili + existential and positional auxiliaries*” both in Siberian Turkic (NEVSKAYA 2005) and in Dzungar Tuvan (RIND-PAWLOWSKI 2015). In Uyghur and Uzbek, imperfect participles used in combination with an auxiliary verb *bol-* ‘be, become’ express proximative semantics in case the lexical verb denotes an involuntary action. Otherwise this construction expresses a planned action that may occur or not depending on an agreement or a decision to be made. Uzbek and Uyghur relational nouns with the lexical semantics ‘in front, before’, ‘movement, effort’, ‘eve’ express proximativity with verbal nominals of lexical verbs and contribute to typology of sources of grammaticalization of proximativity along with the Turkish spatial postposition *üzere* (NEVSKAYA 2005; MENZ 2015) and the Altai noun *d’an* ‘side’ (OZONOVA et al., this volume). MEMTIMIN’s material also features the resultative *-(X)p qal* in the past tense form expressing proximative semantics, similarly to the corresponding resultatives in Kazakh and Kirghiz. MEMTIMIN concludes that the choice between various proximative strategies depends on different factors such as animacy of the subject of a construction, the semantics of auxiliary verbs used in it, the temporal distance between the occurrence of the expected event and the time of speaking, along with

lexical aspect of the main verb and other factors. MEMTIMIN's analysis of lexical restrictions on the proximative readings of forms belonging to other categories opens further directions for research on the category of Proximative.

Aiiiana OZONOVA, Alyona TAZRANOVA, Larisa TYBYKOVA and Surna SARBASHEVA describe proximative forms in Altai and its three dialects Telengit, Tuba and Chalkan. The choice of the dialects was determined by the fact that they belong to different groups of Altai: Chalkan belongs to the northern group, Telengit to the southern one, and the Tuba dialect, although being in the northern group, has much in common with the literary Altai language. The authors distinguish three types of proximative language means: 1) synthetic forms (in Chalkan and Tuba); 2) verbal analytical constructions (in literary Altai and all dialects); 3) syntactic constructions (in literary Altai). In the opinion of the authors, the Chalkan proximative synthetic form *-ArAyt / -Ayt* is a contracted analytical construction consisting of the infinitive *-ArA* and the auxiliary verb *t'at-* 'lie'. We suggested (NEVSKAYA 2011) that this form could be a contraction of the infinitive and the auxiliary *et-* 'do', especially taking into consideration areal and historical data. Chalkan belongs to the same sub-branch of Siberian Turkic languages as Shor, where we find this proximative construction. (This did not exclude the possibility that the auxiliary *t'at-* 'lie' was an original part of this synthesized construction, or that both constructions existed and fell together at some stage.) Another Altai proximative construction *-ArdIŋ berd'anda* consists of the future participle *-(A)r* of the lexical verb in the genitive case (*-DIŋ*), the adverb *beri* 'here' and the grammaticalized noun *d'an* 'side' in the personal-possessive form of the third person singular in the locative (< *d'an-in-da* 'at the side'). It presents another locational source for proximative formations, not mentioned earlier in typological research.

Aziyana BAYYR-OOL and Ljudmila SHAMINA's article on proximatives in Standard Tuvan shows a number of patterns that could be Mongolian loans: analytical construction with the auxiliaries *čapta-* 'to approach', *čīga-* 'to be close, to reach (the beginning, the end)' and the *-Vr* form of the lexical verb. There are plenty of further means to express proximative semantics that are in principle common to all South Siberian Turkic languages. However, since Tuvan does not have a specialized infinitive form and uses various other means, most commonly the participle *-Ar* in the positions where other Siberian Turkic languages have their infinitives, these constructions are more structurally diverse. Sometimes the participle is inflected for case, person and number; sometimes it only receives the dative case marker, thus coming very close to the infinitive constructions of the neighbouring Turkic languages with the dedicated infinitive going back to the participle *-Vr* in the dative case.

Monika RIND-PAWLOWSKI's article deals with the Dzungar Tuvan inventory of finite forms with future reference. Dzungar Tuvan proximative means are very close to the forms that we see in other South Siberian varieties; however, Dzungar Tuvan has Kazakh loan forms that are primarily intentional ones, i.e. the form *-MAKSI* and *de*-based constructions. Interestingly, the suffix *-D* can mark both absolute anteriority to the moment of speaking, and relative anteriority to the orientation point of a future event. The author's comparison of the usage of avertive and proximative forms has revealed the interesting fact that some prospective forms refer to the imminent event as a whole and some refer to its various phases (the beginning or the ending point). I am not sure whether this could be determined

by the actional type of the predicates used with these forms; one should like to look into this in more detail in the future. However, the possibility of a distribution of proximative / avertive forms depending on the phase structure of impending actions should be taken into consideration in further research.

Summing up, we wish to highlight the fact that proximative means are extremely diverse and numerous in Turkic languages, as the analyzed material of several languages representing the four main branches of Turkic show.

- All Turkic languages described here, use various intentional forms and constructions to render proximative semantics under certain conditions, mostly with inanimate subjects or involuntary actions. It is not always possible to decide whether it is proximative or intentional semantics otherwise. Contextual markers indicating the pragmatic relevance of an impending action for the reference moment (adverbials ‘now’, ‘at that moment’, etc.) can contribute to the proximative reading of such forms (compare *At that moment, s/he intended to do something* versus *At that moment, s/he was going/about to do something*).
- Oghuz Turkic seems to be the only branch that does not use proximative forms based on the infinitive or purpose converb of the lexical verb in combination with existential and positional auxiliary verbs; those are formations found in e.g. Modern Uyghur, Kazakh, Kirghiz and Siberian Turkic including Dzungar Tuvan, even if different formations are employed in these languages as infinitives. In Oghuz Turkic, we have not yet encountered “*de*-based” proximative constructions with volitive forms, widely spread in North-Western, North-Eastern and South-Eastern Turkic while these are direct speech constructions not grammaticalized as proximative forms (e.g. they are not used with inanimate subjects).
- Only Turkish seems to have a proximative form with the postposition *üzere* ‘on’ (apart from Northern Azeri, which has probably borrowed this structure from Turkish). We encounter further constructions based on verbal nouns of lexical verbs and grammaticalized nouns in all branches of Turkic, e.g. constructions with the grammaticalized noun ‘in front’ in Uyghur, Uzbek and in Kazakh spoken in China, and with a grammaticalized noun with the lexical meaning ‘side’ in Altai.
- Both Azeri varieties show convergence with Persian (and other Iranian languages spoken in the Caucasus, and also with Aramaic) as far as prospective and proximative formations are concerned. Further research is needed in order to determine whether other Turkic languages of the Caucasus belong to this linguistic area.
- Kipchak Turkic languages spoken in Central Asia have an array of isoglosses in common with South Eastern Turkic in their proximative morphology. We can probably speak of a Central Asian linguistic area which represents a Turkic dialect continuum that was in place long before the formation of modern national states and their standardized languages. Contact phenomena with Kazakh are also present in Dzungar Tuvan that could be considered a peripheral member of this linguistic area. It goes without saying that this hypothesis would need to be substantiated by a look into history.
- Within South Siberian Turkic, a very heterogeneous branch of Turkic, the North Altai varieties are closer to Shor and Khakas than to Southern Altai Turkic in many features, also including Proximative language encoding. It would be worthwhile to check whether Siberian Tatar and Chulym Turkic also belong to this linguistic sub-area sometimes defined as Ob-Yenisei one, as far as the Proximative is concerned, among other categories. It is an interesting fact that a North Tungusic language, Even, possesses proximative constructions

very similar to those found in Shor and Khakas. The question arises whether it used to have closer contacts with this supposed linguistic area.

- Southern Altai Turkic, in its turn, shows a certain closeness to Tuvan in some Proximative isoglosses, but also to Kipchak languages of Central Asia in others.
- Tuvan is characterized by numerous Mongolian loans, also in the Proximative sphere.
- It appears that only the category of Avertive employs materially identical language means (with minor variations) in all branches of Turkic (among language specific means). It is the specialized actional form “converb –A + verb *yaz-/žas-/čas-/d’asta-/žazda-*, etc., with the lexical semantics ‘err, fail, miss the target, lose one’s way, sin, etc.’.

The in-detail investigation of the areal distribution of proximative forms seems to be a very promising research task, for which this volume outlines paths that seem worth pursuing.

6. Conclusion

The categories of Prospective and Proximative are expressed in very different ways in languages belonging even to the same language family. It is rather fascinating to see how different they can be in even genetically and areally very close Turkic languages; compare Southern and Northern Altai. The data presented in this volume show some sources of grammaticalization of proximative forms not noted so far, thus contributing to typological research. Especially promising could be the study of recently discovered semantic and formal types of the Proximative such as anticipatory, alternative, providential, event phase related, etc. (see NEVSKAYA 2015) as well as on proximatives denoting different temporal distances to the impending event. In this volume, the interrelation of proximative contexts and the actional semantics of verbs expressing an impending situation is highlighted by a number of contributions. It is necessary to verify these correlations on further primarily resultative (or perfect), progressive, subjunctive etc. language means.

Research on the non-Altaic languages presented in this volume has also enriched our understanding of the category of Proximative by showing strategies used for encoding proximativity in “non-proximative” languages; among these are the usage of discourse, modal and aspectual particles, clusters of proximative and aspect or evidential semantics, etc. A number of decisive features of Proximative have been revealed here that count also for proximative proper forms: pragmatic markedness of proximative language means, their affinity to the category of inference, etc. For Turkic languages, we can draw some preliminary conclusions about the areal distribution of proximative forms. For the other language families, it could be a longer way to go. We hope that this volume will be an inspiration for further research on the categories of Prospective and Proximative in the languages of Eurasia and beyond.

Literature

- BINNICK, Robert I. 1991: *Time and the Verb: A Guide to Tense and Aspect*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press
- BYBEE, Joan, Revere PERKINS and William PAGLIUCA 1994: *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press