On the Imperfective Future in Ukrainian
Oksana Symkovych
University of Debrecen

In Ukrainian, there is a clear (morphological) distinction between the perfective and imperfective verbs – usually a prefix is attached to an imperfective verb to make it perfective. This is true for the verbs with past tense morphology:

1.   a.   Ja   čytav   knyhu.
           I.NOM   read.PST.1SG.IMP   book.ACC
           I was reading a book / the book.
   b.   Ja   pročytav   knyhu.
           I.NOM   read.PST.1SG.PERF   book.ACC
           I have / had read the book / a book.

If a perfective prefix is attached to a verb with present tense morphology, the resulting verb will express perfective future:

2.   a.   Ja   čytaju   knyhu.
           I.NOM   read.PRES.1SG.IMP   book.ACC
           I am reading a book / the book.
   b.   Ja   pročytaju   knyhu.
           I.NOM   read.FUT.1SG.PERF   book.ACC
           I will have read the book.

Imperfective future, on the other hand, can be expressed in two different ways: either with an inflected copula accompanied by an infinitive (the periphrastic future), as in (3a), or by a morpheme(in some analyses: a clitic) attached to the infinitive (the synthetic or inflectional future), as in (3b):

3.   a.   Ja   budu   čytaty   knyhu.
           I.NOM   be.FUT.1SG   read.INF   book.ACC
           I will be reading a book / the book.
   b.   Ja   čytatymu   knyhu.
           I.NOM   read.FUT.1SG.IMP   book.ACC
           I will be reading a book / the book.

In my presentation, I will compare the existing theories on the structure in (3b): a prescriptive approach by Vyxovanets' and Horodens'ka (2004), a descriptive analysis by Bevzenko (1997), typological analyses by Danylenko (2010) and (2011), as well as Shevelov (1951), which was not taken into account by some of the linguists mentioned above.

I will also attempt to find out whether there are any semantic differences between the constructions in (3a) and (3b), or are they simply two different syntactic structures with the same meaning.

In the final part of the presentation, I will present a syntactic analysis of the synthetic future construction in the framework of Lexical Functional Grammar (Bresnan 1982, Falk 2001) based on Shevelov (1951)'s proposal that the *-mu/-meš/-me* is, in fact, a single morphological unit, not a suffix (*-m-*) combined with a personal ending.

References

Bevzenko, S. 1997. Formy Vyjavu Maibutnioji Diyi v Ukrayins'kyx Dialektax. In: Ukrayins'kyj Dialektolohičnyj Zbirnyk. Kyiv. 213-217.

Bresnan, J. (ed). 1982. The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Danylenko, A. 2011. Is There Any Inflectional Future in East Slavic? A Case of Ukrainian Against Romance Reopened. In: Grammaticalization in Slavic Languages: From Areal and Typological Perspectives. Motoki Nomachi (ed.), 147-177. Sapporo, Slavic Research Center.

Falk, Y. N. 2001. Lexical Functional Grammar. CSLI Publications.

Vyxovanets' I. Horodens'ka K. 2004. Teoretyčna Morfolohiya Ukrayins'koyi Movy. Kyiv.