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1 Introduction

This paper is concerned with the question of whether the ‘renewal’ of grammatical categories is a useful and theoretically viable concept in analyzing and explaining morphosyntactic change. The notion of ‘renewal’ is widely used in language histories and in literature on language change and appears in the title of Meillet’s famous article ‘Le renouvellement des conjonctions’. In this article, he claims that the repeated disappearance and new creation of conjunctions in Indo-European is evidence of ‘the need to renew the expression in order to revive its strength’ (1975 [1915/1916]: 165, our translation). In this view, ‘renewal’ appears to denote a type of morphosyntactic change (or, perhaps more precisely, at least a specific type of motivation for morphosyntactic change). In other uses, especially in language histories, ‘renewal’ is used more ambivalently and can often be interpreted as a mere figure of speech or as a descriptive label for the observation that an emerging new form or construction appears to be similar in function and possibly also in form to an older disappearing form or construction, without necessarily claiming that the disappearing form or construction influences or constrains the newly emerging form or construction. Section 2 provides further details on ways in which the notion of ‘renewal’ is used in the literature and identifies one usage in particular that warrants further scrutiny as a potentially viable theoretical concept for analyzing morphosyntactic change.

‘Renewal’ in this potentially interesting sense, which we call the TRANSFER use of ‘renewal’, would provide an alternative, or at least an important independent complementary aspect, to accounts of the same phenomena in terms of grammaticalization theory. That is, ‘renewal’ and grammaticalization partly cover the same empirical ground. Consequently, in order to show that ‘renewal’ is a type of change of its own, one has to show that the relevant phenomena cannot be accounted for by grammaticalization theory alone. In Section 3, we contrast ‘renewal’ and grammaticalization accounts and predictions on the basis of the possibly most commonly cited example for ‘renewal’, the Latin/Romance future where French chanterai (< cantare habeo) ‘renews’ Latin cantabo. While the empirical evidence is not fully unequivocal, our preliminary conclusion will be that there is little support, empirically as well as theoretically, to postulate ‘renewal’ as a type of change in addition to grammaticalization.

---

1 Alternatively, ‘renovation’ is used by Lehmann (2002 [1982] and elsewhere) and ‘conservative mutations’ by Benveniste (1968). Both authors set up a contrast with ‘innovation’ (Lehmann) or ‘innovating mutations’ (Benveniste), i.e. the creation of categories that have no predecessor in the language. In the German literature, ‘Neuerung/Erneuerung’ can be found.
3 ‘le besoin de renouveler l’expression pour en raviver la force’
However, grammatical constructions obviously do not develop in a vacuum and we, in part, agree with critics of modern grammaticalization theory such as Heath (1998), who chastises it for ignoring the existing grammatical system in its accounts of the development of new grammatical constructions. What is needed, therefore, is an explicit and testable theory of the ways the current language system constrains grammaticalization processes. The untheorized and loose use of ‘renewal’, we would hold, has contributed to the neglect of properly engaging with this task. We conclude the paper by outlining a few of the relevant phenomena and open problems in section 4.

2 ‘Renewal’ in the literature: widely used, hardly theorized

With regard to the way the term ‘renewal’ is used in the literature, we may broadly distinguish between three different uses: (i) the descriptive use, (ii) the recruitment use, and (iii) the transfer use. We outline the different usages in turn and evaluate them as to their theoretical viability. Note that the authors who employ the term do not draw these distinctions, and it is not uncommon that an author employs the term in two or even all three of the uses distinguished here. The reason to distinguish the three views is that they differ quite significantly regarding their theoretical implications.4

First, the term ‘renewal’ (or related terms) is often used in a purely descriptive sense. For instance, Hopper & Traugott state that ‘[r]enewal results primarily in alternate ways of saying approximately the same thing, or alternative ways of organizing linguistic material.’ (2003: 122) The initial result of such a process is what Hopper (1991) has termed LAYERING, i.e. the accumulation of different constructions in a certain grammatical domain, e.g. be going to grammaticalizing in English even though English already has the will- and shall-future constructions. Importantly, this use avoids postulating any other but a descriptive link between functionally (and possibly formally) similar constructions.5

Second, the link between old and new is conceived of in stronger terms in other publications. One metaphor widely employed in this regard is that of RECRUITMENT, a pull-chain understanding of ‘renewal’ as in the following quote by Heine et al. (1991):

In the literature on grammaticalization, **there are indeed many examples suggesting that, once a given grammatical form declines and/or disappears, a new form tends to be recruited on the same conceptual pattern as the old one**, with the result that a kind of morphological cycle emerges. (Heine et al. 1991: 246, emphasis added)

This recruitment view of ‘renewal’ implies a causal nexus between old and new. It is based on the idea that because of the fact that a construction is either lost or weakened (which usually relates to diagnoses of semantic ‘bleaching’ and/or phonetic shortening) a construction6 is ‘pulled’ into the system according to the slogan ‘function seeks form’ or, in Meillet’s words, ‘the need to renew the expression in order to revive its force’ (1975 [1915/1916]: 165–166). An earlier and even stronger statement to this effect is provided by von der Gabelentz (1901 [1891]) in his discussion of the opposing forces of *Bequemlichkeit* (literally ‘comfort’, but often rendered as ‘economy’) and *Deutlichkeit* (‘explicitness’) shaping linguistic change:

[4] There are a few further, less widespread usages of the notion. For example Brinton (1995) explores what she labels ‘functional renewal’, where a form is maintained, but acquires a new meaning. We will not take into account Brinton’s or other less widespread usages of ‘renewal’.

[5] As Martin Becker points out to us, when used descriptively, ‘renewal’ appears to be typically used to refer to a result, i.e. it describes a situation where a construction in a given language has a functional space similar to that of an older one in the same language. By contrast, grammaticalization is typically used to describe a process.

[6] We assume that grammaticalization always affects a grammaticalizing element (‘gram’) within a construction, e.g. go in be going to VP. We therefore generally speak of grammaticalizing constructions and only make reference to grams when in the focus of discussion.
Now, the history of the languages develops in the diagonal of two forces: the need for economy, which leads to the erosion of sounds, and the need for explicitness, which keeps this erosion from leading to the destruction of language. The affixes erode, *and finally vanish without a trace; their functions, however, or similar ones, stay and again strive for expression*. They receive this expression, according to the rule of isolating languages, by means of word order or expressive words. The latter, with time, again undergo agglutination, erosion, and disappearance. (von der Gabelentz 1901 [1891]: 256, emphasis added, our translation)\(^7\)

A causal nexus suggests itself particularly in those cases where the ‘same’ development appears to happen again and again. The best known example of such a (recursive) cycle is the repeated development of new negation markers in many a language, widely known as Jespersen’s cycle. A recent compilation discussing this and other cycles is van Gelderen (ed., 2009). Here, we are not specifically concerned with recursive cycles, but note that the basic questions regarding the empirical and theoretical viability of the notion ‘renewal’ also apply to them.

We identify several problems with the recruitment view of ‘renewal’. First, the repeated development of a new construction in the functional domain of an already existing one poses empirical difficulties. The problem, also noted by Bybee (1988) and Bybee et al. (1994), arises in cases of *layering*, i.e. whenever multiple new constructions with similar meanings develop concurrently or in brief succession of each other. The presumed expressive need caused by the weakening of the old construction should be resolved by the development of a single new construction. Expressive needs cannot motivate the innovation of new functionally similar and overlapping constructions in rapid succession. Instructive examples of layering are provided by Smith (2006) who undertakes a crosslinguistic survey of the ‘renewal’ of the category of anteriority in the sense of the repeated grammaticalization of constructions in this grammatical domain. Based on the *GRAMCATS* database (see Bybee et al. 1994 for details), he finds that within a sample of 76 languages, there are 57 anterior grams with 34 of them appearing together with at least one other anterior gram in the same language, so that after all only 39 of the 76 languages possess anterior grams. One language, Margi, even possesses five anterior grams (2006: 140).

The more fundamental problem of pull-chain scenarios is the fact that they are examples of the widespread practice to phrase claims and observations on diachronic change in teleological terms. This is highly problematic for the reason mentioned by Hopper and Traugott (2003):

> Some think of the cycle [of ‘renewal’, UR/NH] as starting with reduction of a form, in extreme cases to zero, followed by replacement with a more expressive form ... This kind of model is extremely problematic, because it suggests that a stage of language can exist when it is difficult or even impossible to express some concept. (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 124)

Lass (1980) and many others have made clear the logical pitfalls of teleological approaches to language change: A pull-chain scenario in morphosyntax presupposes a stage of the language which is functionally insufficient. If the old construction was so important that it had to be replaced, why was it lost or allowed to weaken in the first place? Teleological assumptions are also problematic for all categories which are not universally attested in natural languages: If category x is so important, why is it not grammatically expressed in all languages?

We hold, by contrast, that a language and its elements and structures will always in principle be functionally adequate, being shaped by speakers’ needs. Accordingly, we consider a pull-chain understanding of ‘renewal’ to be

\(^7\) ‘Nun bewegt sich die Geschichte der Sprachen in der Diagonale zweier Kräfte: des Bequemlichkeitstriebes, der zur Abnutzung der Laute führt, und des Deutlichkeitstriebes, der jene Abnutzung nicht zur Zerstörung der Sprache ausarten lässt. Die Affixe verschleifen sich, verschwinden am Ende spurlos: ihre Functionen aber oder ähnliche bleiben und drängen wieder nach Ausdruck. Diesen Ausdruck erhalten sie, nach der Methode der isolirenden Sprachen, durch Wortstellung oder verdeutlichende Wörter. Letztere unterliegen wiederum mit der Zeit dem Agglutinationsprozesse, dem Verschliffe und Schwunde …’
logically incoherent. In the following, whenever we refer to uses allowing for a teleological interpretation, we take it that the relevant point can also be made without assuming teleology.  

In the third usage, i.e. the Transfer use, the similarity between old and new is not based on a pull- (or push-)chain, but on an interaction between two constructions where functions are ‘passed on’ or ‘pass over’ from the old to the new construction, or alternatively, are ‘taken over’ or ‘acquired’ by the new construction from the old one. We are not aware of any theoretical elaboration of the details of such processes of transfer and it is often unclear whether the statement is merely a more vividly metaphorical variant of the descriptive view. An early example is Benveniste on the Latin perfect and another one is Fleischman on the Latin and Romance past and future constructions:

In the Latin verbal paradigm, a reorganization of the original perfectum is effected, a change which leads through a split to two different forms. **The value inherent in the synthetic perfectum (audīvī) is passed on to the periphrastic perfectum (audītum habeō),** which restricts the value of audīvī to that of an aorist. ...  
Thus **the periphrastic form is heir to the original perfectum,** not only by virtue of a historical sequence of events, but also because it brings to lights its inherent value. (Benveniste 1968: 88–9; emphasis added)

In both past and future tense system, then, **an analytic formation** which began as a marker of aspect (present relevance) **has acquired,** in addition, **a temporal function belonging to a synthetic rival.** (Fleischman 1982: 99, emphasis added)

While the descriptive, recruitment, and transfer uses of ‘renewal’ differ in their assumptions regarding the link between old and new, they share the characteristic of being extremely vague regarding their theoretical and empirical underpinnings. This is not a problem for the descriptive use, as this use does not involve any theoretical claims. But for the other two uses, the theoretical status of the concept of ‘renewal’ is obviously of some import. Is it a type of linguistic change of its own? If so, how does it relate to other proposed types of morphosyntactic change, in particular grammaticalization? Empirically, what does it take to count as an instance of ‘renewal’? To the best of our knowledge, these questions have never been explicitly and comprehensively addressed in the literature. The best one can find in this regard are passing remarks of the kind we briefly review now.

For some authors, including Hopper & Traugott (2003) as well as Heine et al. (1991) quoted at the beginning of this section, ‘renewal’ appears to be an aspect of grammaticalization, i.e. something that more or less regularly happens as a concomitant of grammaticalization processes. While they take note of the phenomenon, they do not appear to consider it necessary (or useful) to provide a theoretical account in addition to what is already covered by grammaticalization theory. Other authors take a different view. For Lehmann, ‘renewal’ (his ‘renovation’) is orthogonal to grammaticalization and appears to be conceived of as a type of change of its own. He provides the following definitions:

> [W]e make a clear distinction between the two diachronic relations ‘y continues x’ and ‘y replaces x’. Within a grammaticalization scale, the relation ‘y continues x’ is equivalent to the relation ‘x is grammaticalized to y’.  
> **However, the relation ‘y replaces x’ is neither a relation of grammaticalization nor of degrammaticalization.**

---

8 Similar logical problems pertain to push-chain accounts, which are also commonly invoked in the literature on language change, if less often under the label of ‘renewal’. A push-chain account logically implies a period of layering. If layering was acceptable to speakers for some time, why would an old construction need to be ousted from the language after a certain period? Also, in general as with alleged pull chains, it is not clear why causal factors should be at work in some cases and not in others, where we do not observe an apparent ‘renewal’ of an old construction (see e.g. Haspelmath 1998: 56–57 on both cases of loss and retention of old presents with future meaning when new presents grammaticalize). Note that this does not mean that the development of a new construction may not more indirectly impact on an old one, as discussed in section 4.2.
shall call it, with Meillet’s ‘renouvellement’ in mind, the relation of renovation, also called renewal in the literature. (Lehmann 2002 [1982]: 18, emphasis added)

That is, ‘renewal’ is something that may happen attendant upon grammaticalization processes, but it is not fully accounted for by grammaticalization theory and would thus need a theoretical account of its own.

Heath (1998) considers ‘renewal’ an alternative to (modern) grammaticalization theory, which he criticizes for its neglect of the influence the current grammatical system exerts on grammatical change:

In the absence of unusual contact situations, I argue here, the ‘old’ grammatical patterns (categories and forms) are always decisive in shaping the way ‘new’ patterns fit into the system. Grammaticalization is not the work of a mechanical monster or other external force. Nor are lexical items like ‘go’ and ‘have’ propelled by preprogrammed navigational paths into morphology, in the fashion of drone aircraft. Instead, the old grammatical system typically renews itself by acquiring new raw material to express old categories, often additionally preserving the original formal arrangements. (Heath 1998: 730)

Heath’s argument is a particularly strong version of the recruitment view. His main concern are what he calls hermit-crab phenomena, for which he proposes an analysis in terms of the recruitment view: a phonetically weakened suffix is replaced by an independent word of similar phonetic (but longer) shape and more or less (often less) compatible semantics. Heath argues that the decay of the suffix induces the word to (in a sense, ‘jump’ and) replace the suffix relatively abruptly without going through a clitic stage. This analysis thus involves a particularly strong and direct causal link between old and new form, with the old form literally recruiting the new one as its substitute.

In other sections of the paper, Heath is more generally concerned with the influence of the existing system on ongoing change and observes, contrasting modern grammaticalization theory with its forerunners:

The point is that the centrally important Indo-Europeanists Kurylowicz, Meillet, and Benveniste, who are correctly credited with inaugurating the modern study of grammaticalization, were keenly aware that the latter did not take place in a vacuum. They realized that grammaticalization, above all in the tense-aspect-mood-negation system of verbs, was tightly controlled by system-internal considerations, including both the gross morphosyntactic form of the language (inflected, analytic, etc.) and a strong tendency to maintain preexisting categories (whether universal or language specific) … (Heath 1998: 732f)

In this usage ‘renewal’ very broadly refers to the (undeniable) fact that linguistic change (of any type) does ‘not take place in a vacuum’. This, however, almost immediately raises the question of how exactly one should conceive of the influence of the existing system on ongoing change. All types of linguistic change begin with variation in the use of existing forms and constructions. But this very general observation does not necessitate a concept of ‘renewal’. For ‘renewal’ to be a viable and useful notion, one would have to be able to show that there are some more specific constraints on change rooted in the existing system, as suggested by the use of ‘tightly controlled’ by Heath in the quote above.

In Heath’s scenario the issue of making precise of what is meant by ‘tightly controlled’ is addressed by pointing to the existing construction into which new material is ‘drawn’. However, as discussed above, such a recruitment scenario is fraught with major empirical and conceptual problems which prohibit us from pursuing this scenario any further. What about the other two uses of ‘renewal’? We already saw that the descriptive view is without theoretical implications and it will therefore not interest us any further here. However, it remains to be explored whether the transfer scenario can be developed into a theoretically viable concept. At this point, therefore, we believe that, if ‘renewal’ is at all a concept helpful for the analysis of linguistic change, it would consist in a conceptually and empirically sound elaboration of the transfer view.
We conclude from these observations and arguments that the most promising approach for arriving at a theoretically and empirically viable explication of ‘renewal’ is to investigate the following two alternative hypotheses:

**H1** All semantic developments of new grammatical constructions and markers can be fully accounted for in terms of grammaticalization theory. There is no need and no evidence for ‘renewal’ as a type of change of its own.

**H2** Renewal is a type of linguistic change of its own which overlaps with grammaticalizational change in that it also involves the semantic development of new grammatical constructions and markers. Renewal changes are to a large extent shaped by preexisting grammatical constructions – possibly in the way of some kind of transfer of semantic components –, while grammaticalizations primarily follow their inherent dynamics, as spelled out in the various proposals for paths of grammaticalization.

With regard to H2, it may be noted that there are various possible variants for this hypothesis, including for example the possibility that ‘renewal’ is a subtype of grammaticalizational change to which some, but not all, principles of grammaticalization apply, but which also involves its own defining features relating to control by the existing system. The argument developed below pertains to all these variants, but they will not be addressed in detail in order to avoid making the exposition unnecessarily complex.

In the next section, we investigate these two alternative hypotheses on the basis of the Latin and French synthetic futures. We argue that the remarkable similarity between the two constructions can in fact be fully accounted for in terms of grammaticalization theory, specifically by the principle of source determination. This does not mean that grammaticalizations happen ‘in a vacuum’. In this regard we partially agree with Heath’s critique of modern approaches to grammaticalization which all too often make it appear as if it took place in a vacuum. There is certainly a need to develop further the account of how ongoing grammaticalizations interact with existing constructions, a topic we take up in section 4. However, our preliminary conclusion will be that although striking similarities between constructions which historically follow each other may exist, there is no coherent homogenous phenomenon ‘renewal’ that would constitute a type of linguistic change of its own, whether in a transfer sense or otherwise.
3 Grammaticalization contra ‘renewal’

In this section we investigate the two hypotheses developed at the end of the preceding section. Oversimplifying the issue somewhat, the basic goal is to determine whether one needs the concept ‘renewal’ in order to account for similarities between two constructions of different age. We do so on the basis of the probably most widely cited example for ‘renewal’, namely the synthetic future tenses in Latin and French.

The argument is structured as follows. In section 3.1, we briefly comment on the problem of lacking criteria for examples of ‘renewal’ and determine that, ideally, not only functions but also forms of old and new constructions should be very similar in order to count as an instance of ‘renewal’. Section 3.2 briefly reviews the facts for the Latin and French synthetic futures and concludes that there is indeed a very close semantic match between these two constructions beside their formal similarity. In section 3.3, we argue that this match is not as remarkable as it may seem at first glance, but can be accounted for by the grammaticalizational principle of source determination, which predicts that constructions deriving from similar sources will develop similar meanings. The real test case for ‘tight control’ by the system, then, is to compare constructions with similar macrofunctions such as ‘future’ deriving from different types of source meanings. This test is applied in section 3.4 to the French futur proche. Though the data are not clear in all details (as is commonly the case with newly emerging constructions), the overall evidence supports the view that constructions from different types of sources do indeed develop differently. Thus, there is little empirical support for a concept of ‘renewal’.

3.1 What does it take to count as an instance of ‘renewal’?

To the best of our knowledge, authors making use of the term ‘renewal’ (or one of its kin) hardly ever explicitly address the issue of what it takes to count as ‘renewal’. Implicitly, it seems to be widely assumed that having a similar function and being in a broadly conceived temporal successor relation is sufficient for applying this term. Thus, for example, the fact that some modern Indo-European languages no longer have case declensions and, in some contexts, use prepositions in grammatical functions broadly related to grammatical cases is considered a ‘renewal’ of the case system by prepositions. But does it really make sense to claim that prepositions renew a morphological case system (especially when the earlier stage already included prepositions as in the case of Latin and the Romance languages)? On what level of granularity is the relationship of ‘renewal’ supposed to hold: whole ‘systems’ such as the case system, the tense-aspect-mood system etc. (see the quote from Heath above)? Or on the level of specific forms and functions? In the latter case, which range of functions is required in order to claim that preposition X counts as a ‘renewal’ of case Y? There may be a few cases, in particular negation, where answers to these questions appear to be straightforward. But even in the case of negation matters become very complex once one takes into account questions of scope, interaction with mood, etc.

In contradistinction to most of the literature, a few authors have made the possibility of extensive functional similarity contingent on formal similarity. Thus, Lehmann states (and see also Bybee et al. 1994: 19–21):

[T]wo grammatical constructions can be functionally similar only to the extent that they are formally similar. If the renovation of a construction enters upon a path that cannot lead to anything formally similar to the former construction a complete replacement of the old function will never be obtained, and to this extent the change will be partly renovative, partly innovative. Consider the change that is often called the renovation of Latin case inflection by prepositional constructions. Prepositions will never become case suffixes; even their development into case prefixes is relatively rare. (Lehmann 2002 [1982]: 19, emphasis added)
This view implies that analytical constructions quite generally cannot replace synthetic constructions unless the grammaticalizing element is placed in a position which could at least in principle lead to an affix of the same type as the form being renewed.

Here, we do not pursue these issues any further, as our overall conclusion is that ‘renewal’ is not a useful and viable concept for the analysis of linguistic change. It should be noted, however, that resolving them would be one of the major tasks upon anyone who wishes to uphold the concept of ‘renewal’. For present purposes, it will suffice to note that the example we discuss in the next two sections fulfils the criteria of the most restrictive definition of ‘renewal’ we can think of: The constructions are formally identical (other than matching on the segmental level). Both involve suffixes which combine person and TAM values. And they match on the level of specific functions (i.e. usage contexts), not simply on the less sharply delimited level of a general ‘gram-type’ (Bybee et al. 1994) such as ‘future’.

3.2 From Latin to French into the future

The loss of the Latin synthetic futures and the creation of the French futur simple is probably the most frequently cited example for ‘renewal’ starting with Meillet (1975 [1912]) and including the general introductory works on grammaticalization (e.g. Lehmann 2002 [1982]: 19, Hopper & Traugott 2003: 124; also Heine et al. 1991: 244 who make general reference to ‘go-futures’). Moreover, this case has been claimed to display ‘renewal’ in a strong sense with regard to form and function, i.e. as the recreation of a construction that is strikingly similar to an older construction with regard to both expression and content. For instance, Lehmann notes:

There are admittedly cases where the new construction entirely and almost instantly replaces the old one, taking a function and shape maximally similar to the old ones; this has occurred in the renovation of the Latin future in the Romance languages. (Lehmann 2002 [1982]: 19; emphasis added)

With regard to future constructions in general, several authors have claimed that future seems to be a category especially prone to ‘renewal’, e.g. Meillet (1975 [1912]: 144-146) and Barceló (2007: 47). In a similar vein, Fleischman stresses that future is – at least in some languages – a category ‘sufficiently important’ so that it is renewed as soon as an existing future construction loses in expressive force:

Categories can, of course, become dysfunctional and eventually be eliminated from a language […]. But if a category is of sufficient importance in a language – as future was in Latin and still is in Romance – it will survive the corrosive effects of various sorts of changes and will do so typically by replacing its endangered exponents with a new set of functionally analogous but more viable forms. (Fleischman 1982: 104)

Like Fleischman, several authors attempt to make explicit the factors at work in the creation of the Romance future. Explanations range from pull- or push-chain accounts to statements of a general trend from synthetic to analytic formations and even claims that cultural developments such as the rise of Christianity and its sociolinguistic effects might have been responsible for the erosion of the complex affixal morphology of Latin (see Fleischman 1982: 40ff for an overview). Again others point to a need to have more distinctive forms that avoid syncretism with forms of other paradigms (e.g. Dreer 2013).

A close examination reveals that the Latin and French synthetic future constructions indeed show an impressive similarity both on a formal and on a functional level. Both are affixal and share all major temporal and modal usages. We illustrate the semantic overlap with one Latin and one French example each per function, drawing on standard reference grammars and descriptions. If not otherwise indicated, the examples are from Hofmann (1965:
310–312) for Latin and from Batchelor & Chebli-Saadi (2011: 255ff) for French. First of all, the basic future-related function of expressing a prediction is found for both constructions including the sub-type of the ‘historical future’.10

(1) prediction11

a. bene vale: apud Orcum te video
farewell in afterlife.ACC.SG.M ACC.2SG see.FUT.1SG
‘farewell: I shall meet you in the afterlife’ (Plautus, Haverling 2010: 375)

b. Adeline arrivera demain.
Adeline arrive.FUT.3SG tomorrow
‘Adeline will arrive tomorrow.’

(2) historical future

a. annus hic erit insignis novi
year.NOM.SG.M DEM.NOM.SG.M be.FUT.3SG distinguished.NOM.SG.M new.GEN.SG.M
hominis consulatu […]
man.GEN.SG.M consulship.ABL.SG.M
‘this year would be distinguished by the consulate of a new man’ (Liv. VII I, Samuelsson 1905-6: 36)

b. La bataille des Plaines d'Abraham entraîna la chute de Québec en 1759;
SG.F battle POSS.PL Plains of_Abraham lead.PST.3SG SG.F fall POSS Québec in 1759
ce sera la fin de la Nouvelle-France.
DEM.SG.M be.FUT.3SG SG.F end POSS SG.F New_France
‘The battle for the Plains of Abraham led to the fall of Quebec City; that would be the end of New France.’

Moreover, both constructions occur in a number of modal functions (ex. (3)-(7)). These are, first, conjecture and inference, which are often subsumed by Latinists under a single category potential future as both encode probability (e.g. Sjögren 1906: 109ff, Hofmann 1965: 311).12 Closely connected to these usages is the gnomic future which expresses general truths. Another frequent usage is imperative function. Finally, the future can also be used for the expression of indignation in the 1st person in reaction to someone else’s request.

---

9 Naturally, categorization and terminology vary across reference grammars and descriptions. Here, with a few exceptions, we disregard variation depending on lexemes or speech act and focus on different usage contexts which appear to be part of the semantics of the future constructions themselves (inasmuch as such a distinction is at all possible). Furthermore, we standardized terminology according to contemporary usage in cross-linguistic descriptions. However, in order to accommodate descriptive traditions, we have added especially widespread mentions of additional subtypes or derived usages as well as alternative terminology in footnotes. Note, that the treatment here is meant to cover major functional differences between usages as noted by grammarians, rather than offer an exhaustive list. It goes without saying that we are dealing with a heterogeneous list of functions which are uncontrolled above and beyond values of tense and modality.

10 The following abbreviations are used in this paper: ABL=ablative, ACC=accusative, AOR=aorist, COMP=complementizer, DAT=dative, DEM=demonstrative, F=feminine, FUT=future, GEN=genitive, INDEF=indefinite, INF=infinitive, LOC=locative, M=masculine, N=neuter, NEG=negation particle, NOM=nominative, OBJ=objective, PL=plural, POSS=possessive, PPM=participle present middle, PPF=participle past perfective, PRF=perfect,PRS=perfect, PST=past, REL=relative pronoun, SG=singular, VOC=vocative.

11 We consider the so-called deliberative function where the speaker wonders what to do (e.g. Oh no! What shall I do now?), listed by some authors as a separate usage, to be a subtype of the general predictive function, albeit restricted to a specific type of speech act. Another related subtype encoding a hedged statement is touched on in section 3.4.

12 The ‘conjecture’ usage may be considered a subtype of prediction with a weaker sense of certainty. However, we here follow the grammarians’ categorization. Note further that formulas expressing an optative sense as listed in Hofmann (1965: 310) for Latin, as well as suggestive usages like e.g. Batchelor & Chebli-Saadi’s (2011: 257) Tu comprendras que je ne peux pas lui faire confiance are here considered as further subtypes of the potential future.
(3) conjecture

a. Iratast credo nunc mihi: placabit palla angry_be.3SG believe.1SG now DAT.1SG please.FUT.3SG coat.NOM.SG.F quam dedi REL.ACC.SG.F give.PRF.1SG

‘I believe she is angry with me: The coat I gave her will please her’ (Plautus Men. 600, Hofmann 1965: 311)

b. L’été sera pluvieux à Halifax, je crois. summer be.3SG rainy.M.SG at Halifax 1SG believe.1SG

‘The summer will be rainy in Halifax, I think’

(4) inference

a. haec erit bono genere nata DEM.NOM.SG.F be.FUT.3SG good.ABL.SG.N birth.ABL.SG.N born.NOM.SG.F nil scit nisi verum loqui nothing know.3SG except truth.ACC.SG.N speak.INF

‘She will be of a good family: she cannot but speak the truth’ (Plautus, Wackernagel 2009 [1920, 1924]: 263)

b. Irène est absente. Elle aura encore sa migraine. Irène be.3SG absent.SG.F she have.FUT.3SG again POSS.3SG.F migraine

‘Irène is absent. She’s probably gotten a migraine again.’

(5) gnomic usage

a. pulchra mulier nuda erit quam beautiful.NOM.SG.F woman.NOM.SG.F naked.NOM.SG.F be.FUT.3SG than pulchrior dressed_in_crimson.NOM.SG.F beautiful.COMP.NOM.SG.F

‘A beautiful naked woman will be more beautiful than when clad in crimson’

b. Il y aura toujours des gagnants et des perdants. there have.FUT.3SG always INDEF.PL winner.PL and INDEF.PL loser.PL

‘There will always be winners and losers.’

(6) imperative

13 Some usages in this domain may be characterized as hortative, see Batchelor & Chebli-Saadi’s (2011: 257) account for French.

a. si sapies, tacebis if know.FUT.2SG keep_silence.FUT.2SG

‘If you know it, you will keep silence’

b. Vous ferez le ménage et vous préparerez le déjeuner! 2PL make.FUT.2PL the laundry and 2PL prepare.FUT.2PL the dinner

‘You will do the laundry and you will prepare dinner!’ (Riegel et al. 2014: 552)

(7) indignation

a. Ego saltabo? Sanus hercle non es 1SG dance.FUT.1SG sane.NOM.SG.M hercules.VOC.SG.M not be.2SG

‘I should dance? By Hercules, you are not sane!’
b. Quoi? J’accepterai, moi, qu’on me remplace?

This list presents the main functions, temporal and modal, that are listed in the literature. There is no major function not found for both Latin and French when standard reference grammars and descriptions are consulted. Of course, depending on the precise period, register and other factors, it may be the case that not each and every usage is found in all varieties. This general qualification notwithstanding, this survey corroborates assertions of a ‘maximal similarity’ (Lehmann) between the constructions. So the question to be addressed is how this maximal similarity can be accounted for. Could it be that the older construction in one way or another influenced the development of the younger one? How could this have happened? Or is there an alternative way to account for the similarity?

3.3 An alternative explanation for functional overlap: source determination

The concept of ‘renewal’, in all variants outlined in 2, invokes a link between the functional space of one construction and that of another, older one, and we will explore the possibility of such a link involving the transfer use in the next section. An alternative way of accounting for the functional spectrum of a construction, however, is to link it back to its own semantic origins. In grammaticalization literature, it has often been observed that there is a systematic relationship between the type of source lexeme and the gram it develops into. For example, body part terms such as ‘head’ or ‘back’ have been observed to develop into adpositions meaning ‘on’ or ‘behind’ in several unrelated languages (cp. Svorou 1988: 132). A refinement of this view is the hypothesis of source determination proposed by Bybee et al. (1994) who argue that ‘the source meaning uniquely determines the grammaticalization path that the gram will travel in its semantic development’ (1994: 9). Understood in a strong sense, the source determination hypothesis is incompatible with any kind of influence of the existing system on the development of a construction other than providing the building blocks for the source constructions. Even in such cases as the Latin and French futures, where we may perceive a striking similarity between constructions, the respective functional space is to be explained by the meanings of the respective source construction, rather than by some kind of link between them. An argument along these lines for the Latin and French synthetic futures would roughly look as follows:

Future constructions (i.e. constructions, one of whose senses is prediction, cp. Bybee et al. 1991: 19) are argued by Bybee et al. (1991) and Bybee et al. (1994) to evolve from four different types of sources. The first one are the so-called aspectual futures whose semantic range is so broad as to also cover future reference, e.g. the German present indicative Ich spiele morgen Fußball (1SG play.1SG.PRS.IND tomorrow soccer) ‘I’ll play soccer tomorrow’. Second, we find future constructions that evolve from constructions expressing ‘agent-oriented’ modalities. Bybee and her colleagues subdivide what is otherwise subsumed as ‘deontic’ into so-called agent-oriented modality (ability, desire, and obligation) and speaker-oriented modality (the semantic family of requests and commands).

---

14 Some speakers may prefer a conditional in this example.
15 Another modal usage is the so-called ‘concessive’ usage which is listed by some authors both for Latin (Hofmann 1965: 311) and French (Sten 1964: 58 and Imbs 1960: 52). A more precise label, however, may be ‘irrelevance conditional’ as it expresses unconcern for a certain given situation. In terms of modality, these examples encode the possibility that a certain situation may or may not be the case, irrespective of which another event is asserted to take place. We do not include this usage in the main text as other readings of the examples given may be possible and it is an old-fashioned usage in French. Compare some examples: Laudabant alii claram Rhodon aut Mytilenen … ‘May/Let others praise famous Rhodes or Mytilene […] (nothing) has struck me as the house of resonating Albunea’ (Horace, Hofmann 1965: 311) and Les moteurs sauteront comme ils veulent. ‘The motors may hiccup as they wish. [I don’t care.]’ (from early 20th century French) or the phrase Arrivera ce qui arrivera ‘Come what may’ (Imbs 1960: 52).
16 Note that Bybee et al. (1994) do allow for certain types of interaction between elements and structures in the language system, see remarks in section 4.2.
This is a consequence of their finding that grammaticalization paths lead from sub-types of agent-oriented modality to epistemic modality, and on to speaker-oriented modality (see Bybee et al. 1991: 22–25). The third category involves grams stemming from verbs of movement, such as English be going to VP or the French periphrastic future aller faire qc. Finally, the fourth category comprises grams deriving from temporal adverbs.

Since the meanings are different in each of these four sources, the ensuing semantic paths of development differ as predicted by the source determination hypothesis. Thus, if two future constructions arise from two different ones of the four source types, they are predicted to overlap in part, namely in the expression of prediction, but will otherwise show differences. For example, an aspectual future is typically semantically rather bleached, adopting predictive readings from context as in the German example above, whereas a future construction taking off from agent-oriented modality will include all kinds of modal usages, as in the case of English will (see Bybee et al. 1991). By contrast, if two constructions arise from constructions of the same source type, we expect a far-reaching semantic overlap.

Turning to our example, much points to a single source type of the Latin and French synthetic future constructions. In both cases, the evidence suggests that they belong to the realm of agent-oriented modality. In addition, there are indications that the constructions take off from closely related usages within this semantic domain. We first discuss Latin and then turn to French.

Latin has different future formations depending on the respective inflectional class. While the future forms of esse ‘to be’ as well as of verbs in the 3rd and 4th class descend from old subjunctives (also ‘conjunctives’; cp. Leumann 1963 [1926–1928]: 324–327 for an overview of the formation), other verbs show the innovative -b-future. Since the origins of the -b-future remain only partly understood, we focus on the former subjunctives. Note that the -b-forms are also connected to the former subjunctives, as their endings were formed in analogy to the latter (e.g. Meiser 1998: 200).

From what is known from Vedic and Ancient Greek especially, the subjunctive had volitional, intentional (sometimes ‘deliberative’), and predictive (sometimes ‘prospective’) usages, partly depending on the person and speech act (e.g. Delbrück 1871, 1897, Gonda 1956, Tichy 2006, Bozzone 2012 or Dahl 2013). The volitional usage is identified by Delbrück (1897) as the original one, a claim which neatly matches cross-linguistic evidence of the often observed grammaticalization path from grams expressing ‘desire’ (subsuming the expression of wishes as well as of willingness, i.e. volitionality, cp. Bybee et al. 1994: 256). ‘Desire’ is one of the three sub-types of agent-

---

17 Specialists agree that the -b-element descends from a form of PIE *bhuH ‘to be’, but the morphological processes that led to its usage for the formation not only of future forms, but also of the imperfect in Latin, remain subject to discussion. Some authors (e.g. Müller 1964: 54, Fleischman 1982: 34, Bichakjian 1990: 45) assume that finite forms of *bhuH were agglutinated to infinitival or participial forms of lexical verbs, or simply to the stem, but such proposals have problems on morphophonological grounds (see Leumann 1963 [1926–1928]: 327 for a summary). Others have argued that we are instead dealing with a process of morphological reanalysis, followed by analogical extension. For example, Meiser outlines a scenario that takes off with the reduplicated preterite of the perfect of *bhuH. The reduplicated syllable is argued to have been reanalyzed as the stem syllable, and the former stem syllable as part of the inflectional ending, the latter now starting with -b- from -bh-. By way of analogical extension, other verbs adopt these inflectional endings, which now signal imperfect function.

18 Again by way of analogy, future forms are formed along the equivalencies of Ipf. eram erās : Fut. ero eris = Ipf. amābam amābās : Fut. amābo, amābis. Yet another proposal is that the future is the older formation, which served as the analogical model for the imperfect, and whose origins are lost in the mists of time (e.g. Leumann 1963 [1926–1928]: 327).

19 For this reason, we do not agree with Bichakjian’s (1990) claim that a crucial difference between the Latin synthetic future and the French synthetic future is that the former involves a form meaning ‘to be’ (i.e. the -b-element), while the latter involves a gram meaning ‘to have’, i.e. a finite form of habere. Only some of the future formations involve a -b-element and the oldest ones are the old subjunctives, rather than the innovative -b-forms.

18 It was not a ‘subjunctive’ narrowly defined. It is frequent in subordinate clauses, but is just as much found also in main clauses. The label originates in an Ancient Greek term (see Tichy 2006: 1–2).
oriented modality identified by Bybee et al. (1991, 1994), illustrated in Table 1 (the path from ‘desire’ is highlighted in bold print).26 In addition to the volitional, intentional, and predictive usages, Delbrück and others have furthermore identified imperative or hortative functions, all of which match a source in the realm of ‘desire’. The usages of conjecture and inference shown for the Latin stage in 3.2 in addition attest to an epistemic usage encoding probability, completing the semantic match.21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obligation</th>
<th>probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>desire</td>
<td>&gt; intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability</td>
<td>&gt; root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; possibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Semantic pathways from agent-oriented constructions to predictive usages and beyond (adapted from Bybee et al. 1991: 29; bold print added)22

Similarly to the Latin future, the French synthetic future (futur simple) chanterai is also likely to have semantically developed from an agent-oriented modal construction cantare habeo.23 The verb of possession habere in construction with infinitives developed readings of obligation, similar to English have to. For early attestations, readings of ability have also been proposed (e.g. Müller 1964: 72–73)24 and other authors have identified usages indicating volition or desire.25 Overall, however, obligation seems the function that can most clearly be identified and there is agreement in the literature that it is the stepping stone to developing futurate interpretations (Coleman

---

20 Some authors argue that the volitional usage is the result of the specifics of using the subjunctive in the first person and thus to be derived from the predictive one, e.g. Tichy (2006). The attested volitional and intentional usages, however, are clearly semantically more concrete and therefore most probable to be the older ones. Also, note that we know from other languages that an original volitional meaning can survive for a long time in the 1st person. For example English I will can denote prediction and volition, whereas He will only expresses prediction.

21 Note that an alternative account that conceives of the subjunctive as an old present is found in a number of writings. See the appendix for details and for arguments why we believe that an agent-oriented modal source construction is to be assumed.

22 A construction synchronically often covers several steps of development along a grammaticalization path.

23 The literature on this topic is vast. The reader is referred to Müller (1964), Coleman (1971, 1976), and Fleischman (1982), among others. Posner (1997: 325ff) discusses difficulties in the morphological reconstruction, none of which however is a serious challenge for the widely assumed origin in cantare habeo.

24 The semantic gap between ability and obligation is accounted for by Müller by means of their respective origin in the possessive construction: ‘The gap between HABEO DICERE ‘I can, I am able to say’ to ‘I have to, I must’ in Tertullian’s writings will remain a problem of interpretation, unless we assume an old-linate nexus ‘HABEO with inf.’ with the semantic range ‘it is in my power (as ability, necessity, concern) to do this or that’, which slowly gave rise more clearly to the major nuances of ‘I can’ and ‘I must, should’.’ (Müller 1964: 73) (‘Der Sprung von HABEO DICERE ‘ich kann, bin in der Lage zu sagen’ zu dem bei Tertullian offenkundigen ‘ich muss, soll’ wird eine Crux der Interpretation bleiben, es sei denn, man geht aus von einem altlat. Nexus ‘HABEO mit Inf.’ mit dem Bedeutungsfächer ‘ich habe (als Vermögen, Notwendigkeit oder Anliegen) in der Hand, dies oder jenes zu tun’, aus dem sich allmählich die Hauptnuancen ‘ich kann’ und ‘ich muss, soll’ klarer herausgeschält haben.’) Daniel Kölligan points out that German müssen underwent a similar development from expressing ability to expressing obligation, showing that this development is plausible (cp. e.g. Fritz 1997: 85ff). Regarding the French future, the important point here is that the meaning of prediction appears to develop out of obligation.

25 Coleman (1971) following Thielmann (1885) uses the labels ‘possibility’ and ‘obligation/necessity’ besides mentions of ‘volition’ and ‘desire’ by other authors (e.g. Gratwick 1972, see references in Coleman 1971: 219, fn. 2).
1971: 219–220, Fleischman 1982: 58 et passim, Fruyt 2011). This matches typological findings where possessive constructions are attested to develop into markers of obligation and onwards into futures (see Bybee & Pagliuca 1987: 111–112, Bybee et al. 1994: 263). Thus, in the case of the French future, the data is suggestive of the following pathway, highlighted in bold print:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obligation</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>intention</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>future</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>desire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability</td>
<td></td>
<td>root</td>
<td></td>
<td>future</td>
<td></td>
<td>possibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: = Table 3 (adapted from Bybee et al. 1991: 29; bold print added)

Some uncertainties regarding the precise demarcation of the respective source meanings notwithstanding (and variation is expected depending on person, speech act, verbal lexeme etc.), much points to a shared origin of the Latin and French synthetic futures in the domain of obligation/desire. While these are not identical source meanings, the evidence reviewed here and in section 3.2 matches the cross-linguistic findings of Bybee et al. (1991) and Bybee et al. (1994) that these agent-oriented modal source meanings converge on a path, developing into intention, future and on to further epistemic (probability) and speaker-oriented (imperative) functions as illustrated in Table 1 and Table 2. The source determination scenario thus allows for a well substantiated account for the far-reaching overlap between the Latin and French synthetic future constructions without the necessity of postulating some kind of a direct link between the two constructions.

3.4 Deciding between alternative explanations: source determination vs. (a transfer view of) ‘renewal’

In the preceding section we outlined a scenario based on the concept of source determination to account for the far-reaching semantic overlap of the Latin and French synthetic future constructions. This scenario by itself is, of course, not a direct argument against the possibility of a ‘renewal’ scenario to account for the same facts, ‘renewal’

---

26 Some authors prefer a scenario that does not involve modality (at least not in a narrow sense). For instance, Benveniste (1968) argues that the origin of the synthetic future lies instead in usages of habeo + INF with a meaning of ‘predestination’. Such readings arise predominantly when habeo is combined with passive infinitives. The French synthetic future, however, goes back to combinations with active infinitive forms. It is not clear therefore, whether it can in fact be connected to usages involving passive infinitives. Pinkster (1985) argues against intermediate modal meanings between possession and prediction. In view of the many modal meanings attributed to the construction, this seems an unlikely scenario, however.

27 The remaining usage listed in 3.2, ‘indignation’, contains a sense of obligation and thus of a very early stage in the development. The Latin future also attests to this usage. Since the latter appears to derive from a gram encoding volition, it is subject to future research whether the modal coloring differs accordingly.

28 If desire is accepted as a meaning of the source construction of the French future, this would mean that the two formations are even more alike.

29 Apart from convergence on a general level, it may be that retentions of the specific modal meanings can still be found in certain usages. For example, Bybee & Pagliuca (1987) show how will and shall in English continue to show flavors of volition and obligation respectively in certain usages with animate agents. One candidate for such a distinction with regard to French and Latin are the usages subsumed in 3.2 under ‘inference’. Bybee & Pagliuca (1987: 118–119) note with respect to other languages that obligation constructions give rise to epistemic readings of probability, while desire (volition) constructions give rise to stronger meanings of prediction and certainty, e.g. He should be in Rome by now expressing probability, whereas He will be in Rome by now expresses prediction (cp. Bybee & Pagliuca 1987: 119).
here being used in its transfer sense and referring to the fact that the existing future construction – and more generally, the existing tense system – influences the development of the new future construction in such a way that the latter in the end covers almost the identical functional ground as the former. That is, assuming that the transfer view of ‘renewal’ can be spelt out in sufficient detail to allow for testable predictions, we would have two alternative scenarios to account for the same facts and need arguments to decide between them. We argue in this section that the source determination account is to be preferred both for logical and empirical reasons.

Logically, the argument in favor of the source determination account is the fact that such an account is needed anyway for innovative grammaticalizations (Ockham’s razor), i.e. the development of new constructions for which no older model exists (such as, for example, the relatively late development of definite article constructions in some branches of Indo-European). Of course, one could argue that even in these instances, the existing system still exercises some kind of control on the development (which is probably true, see further section 4), but then the notion of ‘renewal’ loses all specificity.

Empirically, the two accounts make different predictions in those instances where old and new constructions go back to clearly diverging source types. Here the source determination account predicts that the functional space of the two constructions will not overlap to the same extent as in those instances where they go back to identical or closely related source constructions. Specifically, the new construction should not take on functions that cannot be connected to its source meaning. The ‘renewal’ account makes the opposite prediction, i.e. that the newly developing construction may take on functions that cannot be connected to its source meaning, but which are in the semantic spectrum of the old construction. Such instances would strongly support the view that functions may indeed be passed over from one construction to the other.

We are not in a position to provide an unequivocal example supporting one or the other prediction, since this requires a degree of granularity which is rarely found in outlines of functional spaces of a particular gram. However, the newly developing periphrastic future (‘future proche’) aller faire qc in French appears to provide some support for the source determination scenario, which we briefly sketch now.

In the literature, it is being discussed whether the periphrastic future is in the process of replacing the synthetic future, which makes it a candidate for the kind of function transfer predicted by the transfer scenario. Fleischman remarks on this topic:

[Collective evidence] points incontrovertibly to the fact that in contemporary Romance, as in English, the expression of futurity is in the process of transfer from a synthetic to an analytic form, recapitulating, as it were, a shift that occurred in later spoken Latin over a millennium and a half ago with the emergence of cantare habeo. (Fleischman 1982: 102)

This periphrastic future, however, evidently descends from a source construction of a different category, namely from a construction with a source meaning involving movement, rather than modality. Accordingly, we would expect markedly different functional spaces on the basis of the source determination hypothesis.

We saw above the semantic paths that agent-oriented modal constructions are attested to follow in the course of their grammaticalization into future constructions, evolving various epistemic and speaker-oriented modal usages. Constructions involving verbs of movement, by contrast, are stated by Bybee et al. (1994) not to evolve a host of other meanings ‘along the way’:

---

30 This is recognized and emphasized by Fleischman, who remarks on the ‘transfer’ of the predictive function but not of other modal meanings.
The evolution of movement constructions into futures is somewhat more direct than the evolution of agent-oriented modalities into futures, producing fewer other uses along the way. The semantics of ‘movement toward’ constructions implies movement in time as well as space, making the transition to future easier. (Bybee et al. 1994: 268)

Thus, movement constructions usually develop less other (typically modal) meanings. Among the few other meanings attested is usage as imperatives.31

Turning to the French periphrastic future, the abundant literature on its distribution in different varieties of French cannot be surveyed in detail here. A finding that stands out, however, is that authors generally assume certain differences in usage between the synthetic future and the periphrastic future, as shown by the extensive discussions of this topic (see Fleischman 1982: 86–102 for a survey of major proposals). While differences along several axes, aspectual, modal, and temporal, have been examined, a few points most authors agree about: First of all, it is generally acknowledged that the difference is not primarily one of temporality, as may be assumed given the label futur proche, i.e. ‘near future’. Many authors have pointed out that both futures can, in principle, be used for events that are at different degrees of temporal remoteness and that a skewing of distribution along the temporal axis is epiphenomenal. Instead, it is argued that differences in aspectual and modal values are more fundamental, complemented by sociolinguistic factors such as style, register, gender and age group (see Fleischman 1982, Wales 1983, Lorenz 1988, Poplack & Dion 2009). In particular, a number of authors have stressed that the periphrastic future, by virtue of its construction type, retains a sense of a ‘link to the present’ (Fleischman 1982: 98, see also Lorenz 1988: 235–239). This link to the present, in turn, is argued to be coupled with readings of assertion (Laurendeau 2000 for Canadian French), imminence, intentionality and related usages (see Fleischman 1982: 96 et passim).32 By contrast, the synthetic future encodes simple prediction and lacks a special link to the present. Prediction being inherently uncertain, the synthetic future also figures in a number of modal usages as can be gathered from section 3.2. In addition and linked to its modal usages, there is a strong preference for the synthetic future over the periphrastic future in negated – i.e. non-asserted – clauses (cp. Lorenz 1988: 236 for written hexagonal French, Laurendeau 2000: 285–6, 288 for Canadian French).

In order to make these somewhat abstract distinctions more palpable to the reader in the context of the present discussion of ‘renewal’, we approach the periphrastic future from the perspective of the functional space of the synthetic future as outlined in 3.2.33 We do not discuss prediction, conjecture, gnomic, imperative, and indignation-encoding usages. Prediction is the defining meaning of ‘future’ grams and thus attested anyway, which most typically also covers ‘conjecture’ (cp. Bybee et al. 1994: 240). Gnomic and imperative usages are late-developing functions according to Bybee & Pagliuca (1987: 119–120), which arise out of the predictive usage and thus present potential late-developing functions of any source type.34 The usage of indignation may be discussed here, but we refrain from doing so, as it is tied to the specific speech act of 1st persons, rather than presenting a general meaning of the future constructions. What remains are the usages as historical future and for inference. We repeat below the

31 Imperative usage is a (speaker-oriented) modality, so why is it found to arise in movement constructions? Bybee et al. (1994: 273–274) point out that imperatives are attested to arise from all four types of source constructions. They explain this peculiar fact by arguing that usage for requests or commands does not hinge on specific modal or aspectual shades of meaning, but on a reinterpretation of an indirect speech act in second person that can occur with futures arising from all kinds of source constructions (cp. Bybee et al. 1994: 273–274).
32 Note that ‘link to the present’ does not necessarily translate into a reading of imminence, as already mentioned. The disjunct of imminence and assertion, for instance, is illustrated by sentences such as Tous les hommes vont mourir (‘All humans (are going to) die’) quoted in Laurendeau (2000: 283).
33 We thank Martin Becker, Marta Donazzan, Corinne Eichinger, Anke Grutschus, and Sandra Lhafi for discussing the examples in this section with us.
34 However, while gnomic usage is attested for the synthetic future, it is not clear whether the periphrastic future may (yet) have this function. With respect to imperative usage, note that there may in some examples be a difference in deontic strength with the synthetic future expressing a polite request and the periphrastic future having a stronger assertive meaning (cp. Batchelor & Chebli-Saadi 2011: 256–257 on the synthetic future).
examples from section 3.2 and add a variant involving the periphrastic future. In both cases, the periphrastic future appears to be at least dispreferred or even unacceptable:\footnote{As pointed out, usages of synthetic future and periphrastic future vary greatly depending on register and sociolinguistic factors. However, in these usages the synthetic future seems to be generally preferred or the only form accepted.}

(8) historical future

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{La bataille des Plaines d'Abraham entraîna la chute de Québec en 1759;} \\
\text{ce sera / ?va être la fin de la Nouvelle-France.}
\end{align*}
\]

'The battle for the Plains of Abraham led to the fall of Quebec City; that would be the end of New France.'

(9) inference

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Irène est absent. Elle aura/ ?va avoir encore sa migraine.}
\end{align*}
\]

'Irène is absent. She’s probably gotten a migraine again.'

The dispreference against the periphrastic future in these usages may be explained by it being a present indicative formation. As such, it does not lend itself to meanings set in the past or in a non-assertive mode. Besides these usages, there is another minor type of modal usage that appears to be only expressed by the synthetic and not by the periphrastic future. Here, the utterance is marked as non-assertive or hedged, a construction found with \textit{verba dicendi} (Barceló’s 2007 ‘futur d’illocutionaire’), but also in other usages:

(10) adapted from Barceló (2007: 52)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A: Ce n'est plus un élément primordial?} \\
\text{this NEG be.3SG more an element crucial}
\end{align*}
\]

‘This is not a crucial element any more?'

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{B: Je dirai que c'est un élément très important de notre défense,}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{le président de la République l'a rappelé récemment.}
\end{align*}
\]

'I would say that this is a very important element of our defense system, the president of the Republic brought it to mind recently'

(11) see Batchelor & Chebli-Saadi (2011: 257) for this and similar examples

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Cela fera vingt euros.}
\end{align*}
\]

‘That’ll be twenty euros.’

To conclude this brief and preliminary survey of the French periphrastic future, the synthetic future is used in certain usages, namely as a historical future, for inference and attenuation or hedging, where the periphrastic future is not or not commonly found. This matches the wide-spread view outlined above that the two formations differ on several levels, modal and otherwise. While these distributional differences are in need of further exploration, we
conclude that we find no evidence of a semantic development of the periphrastic future that suggests an adoption of meanings from the synthetic future, i.e. a transfer scenario of ‘renewal’. Instead, its functional space shows the expected development from its source meaning. Movement in space is extended to movement in time, while the relevance to the present persists in usages expressing imminence, intention and assertion (see Eckardt 2006: 91–127 for a similar analysis of the English be going to-construction.) In the same way as for the comparison with the Latin and French synthetic future, Bybee et al.’s scenario of source determination offers a persuasive account for both similarity and dissimilarity between the two constructions as hinging on their respective source meanings.

3.5 Replacing ‘renewal’: the need for a theory of system constraints on grammaticalization

This concludes our investigation into the usefulness and viability of the notion of ‘renewal’. In section 2, we argued that if this concept is viable at all, it would have to be in what we called its transfer usage. In this regard, ‘renewal’ then would be in competition, as it were, with accounts of such developments in terms of grammaticalization theory. There are two alternative hypotheses that one may entertain in this regard. First, our H1 in section 2, grammaticalization theory can fully account for the semantic development of newly arising grammatical constructions and there is no evidence for another type of change following differing trajectories and principles. Second (our H2), the development of new grammatical constructions has to be accounted for in terms of two possibly overlapping, but still clearly different processes, ‘renewal’ and grammaticalization. The evidence presented in the preceding section is, in our view, in favor of the first hypothesis, although it is of course impossible to predict how the futur proche in French will actually develop further or what a scrutiny of other proposed cases of ‘renewal’ would yield. Perhaps more importantly, we believe to have provided a model as to how an argument in support of ‘renewal’ as a type of change of its own could be made. In the absence of such an argument to date, we would at least preliminarily conclude that there is no place for a concept ‘renewal’ in a theory of grammatical change. If at all, the term could be used as an expositional device to note similarities between older and younger constructions.

This assessment does not mean that we would subscribe to the view attributed by Heath (1998) to modern grammaticalization theorists that grammatical change happens ‘in a vacuum’. Clearly, the existing system provides the building blocks for the source construction from which new constructions develop. Furthermore, it is also typically the case that the development of new constructions interacts in one way or the other with existing ones, including ones sharing similar functions. In this very loose sense, it would seem to be obvious that the existing system influences the development of new constructions. Our rejection of the concept of ‘renewal’ pertains to the much stronger claim that there are actual direct links between constructions within a given functional domain.

In fact, we believe that the widespread loose and untheorized use of ‘renewal’ has been detrimental to the task of properly addressing the issue of system influences on the development of new grammatical constructions. While Heath’s allegation that modern grammaticalization completely ignores the influence of the existing system is too strong (see examples in the next section), we agree with him that much work in grammaticalization wrongly makes it appear as if grammaticalization happened in a vacuum. Moreover, grammaticalization theory can legitimately be criticized for lacking an explicit account of the ways in which the existing system may interact with ongoing grammaticalizational change.

We conclude the paper with a few observations that provide a rough outline of the terrain that needs to be covered in this regard. The term ‘renewal’ has been used to refer to several of the phenomena we briefly mention in the following section, which to us indicates that many authors are indeed aware of the fact that there are aspects of grammaticalizational change which lack a proper account. But, as just argued, the concept of ‘renewal’ is not useful in properly delimiting the relevant phenomena and addressing the theoretical tasks.
4 Beyond ‘renewal’: some observations on system influences on grammaticalization

Research on grammaticalization to date has largely, but (pace Heath 1998) not totally, ignored the way the existing language system may influence the grammaticalization of new constructions. Based on the preceding discussion, we believe that the starting point for a productive approach to this topic is the source determination hypothesis that was outlined and applied in section 3.3. According to this hypothesis, the developmental trajectory of an emerging construction is essentially determined by semantic properties of the source construction. Taking the source determination hypothesis as the starting point means that influences of the existing system only have to be invoked in those instances where the development of a particular construction cannot be exclusively accounted for in terms of this hypothesis. More specifically, system influences need only be invoked for those aspects of the development left unaccounted for by source determination. In other words, the theory of system constraints on grammaticalization is complementary to the theory of source determination, and hence needs to be developed accordingly.

The first domain in which we identify aspects unaccounted for by the source determination hypothesis as proposed by Bybee and colleagues is the formal side of the source construction. Bybee et al.’s hypothesis is directed only at the semantic level. However, whereas a meaning can be postulated for a construction irrespective of the language system, to take into account the linguistic sign as consisting of meaning and form brings system influences into the picture. The forms and structures a grammaticalizing construction may draw on are of several types. One may discern a cline ranging from the influence of individual forms that may form part of a newly grammaticalizing construction, which we call old grams, to far-reaching global influences by general typological features. Thus, one way of capturing certain types of system influences on grammaticalization processes is a more comprehensive theory of source determination, which we will embark on in a preliminary way in 4.1.

Besides (extended) source determination, we identify paradigmatization as the second major domain of system influences on grammaticalization. Paradigmatization is a notion under which various developments have been subsumed (see e.g. Lehmann’s 2002 [1982]: 112ff outline), which may or may not turn out to constrain grammaticalization processes above and beyond source determination. Here, we provide a few examples where we think that there are indeed paradigmatic effects influencing grammaticalizing constructions which are not exhaustively accounted for by source determination. Some of the examples involve analogical change where the syntactic properties of one element or class of elements extend to another element or class of elements, while others involve competition and contrast among constructions within a functional domain. The examples have in common that a grammaticalizing construction may acquire or lose semantic components through interaction with other constructions.

Before we continue, a clarification and a caveat are in order. First, we want to clarify what we mean by ‘existing system’. We do not only include here grammatical forms and constructions which actually predate the emergence of the new construction. Rather, this also comprises constructions which are developing concurrently with the specific construction for which system influence is diagnosed. More generally, it would be a mistake to conceive of the ‘existing system’ as a static unity which steadily radiates influences on newly emerging constructions. In this regard, ‘existing’ is a potentially misleading attribute. The system itself is continuously evolving. The emergence of new constructions thus needs to be seen as part of an overall dynamically evolving repertoire of constructions. As for the caveat, note that the present discussion is a very preliminary attempt to delimit a complex field in need of further study. Thus, the fact that the following sections generate more questions than answers is intentional. There are many more phenomena and topics that systematically belong here than the ones we mention. It is very well possible that other, more insightful and productive ways exist to organize the discussion and to delimit the relevant phenomena.
4.1 Toward a more comprehensive theory of source determination

In Bybee et al.’s (1994: 9) wording, the source determination hypothesis makes the claim that ‘the actual meaning of the construction that enters into grammaticalization uniquely determines the path that grammaticalization follows and, consequently, the resulting grammatical meaning’. In our view, ‘uniquely’ is too strong a wording, because, taken literally, it does not allow for any kind of influences from the existing system. More importantly, by referring only to meaning, this wording appears to suggest that the formal make-up of the source construction has no particular role to play in the further development. By contrast, we believe that there are several levels on which forms and structures of the existing system constrain grammaticalizations. Roughly, one may distinguish three different levels on which the existing grammatical system may influence the development of new grammatical constructions:

1. The level of the individual items which are involved in the emerging construction. Beside the meaning and distribution of the new content word which grammaticalizes, this involves in particular old grams such as -ing and to in be going to VP. Such old grams feed into and constrain the construction with their individual specific semantic and formal properties.

2. The level of existing form classes which may influence and constrain the development of grammaticalizing constructions. Word classes constraining host class expansion are a prime example.

3. The level of very general typological features characterizing a given system, a level which is possibly somewhat controversial but certainly quite difficult to make precise.

First, it is not unusual that a source construction contains morphemes that themselves are grammatical elements in addition to the lexical element turning into a new gram. For example, beside the newly grammaticalizing go, the construction be going to VP contains (an inflectional form of) (to) be, -ing and to; we refer to such elements as old grams. In some cases, the new construction would in fact appear to be functionally similar to the old one simply because it includes the old gram that defined the forerunner construction. This is the case in the French negation pattern ne... pas: The new negation construction ne...pas contains the old negation marker ne and its overall functional space is similar to the functional space that ne used to have.

There are broadly two types of relation between a newly emerging construction and an old gram it may contain, distinguished by the way in which the construction was formed. Depending on the type of relation, the old gram may play different roles in the grammaticalizing construction. Either, what is now an old gram at some point received the support of additional material, a phenomenon that has been referred to as reinforcement (e.g. Lehmann 2002 [1982]: 20). Depending on the construction, this additional material may or may not be similar in meaning to the old gram. An example for similar semantics comes from the development of local particles into prepositions in Germanic or Romance: Morphological case forms such as the accusative or ablative were ‘supported’ by local adverbs which specified their meaning. For instance, ad in ad Romam reinforces the accusative which beforehand could express goals on its own without the support of a spatial adverb (see Vincent 1999). An ongoing case of incipient reinforcement through elements with very similar meanings involves locative prepositions in contemporary spoken German such as in ‘in’ or auf ‘on’. These are often supported by the part-cognate and almost homonymous adverbs drin(nen) and d(a)rauf; e.g. Ich bin drin(nen) im Haus (‘I am inside the house’) and I

36 For Lehmann (2002 [1982]), ‘reinforcement’ is a phenomenon that is to be contrasted with ‘renewal/renovation’: ‘If an element is weakened through grammaticalization, there are, in fact, two possibilities open to linguistic conservatism. The first is to give it up and replace it by a new, but similar one. This is renovation, as we have just seen. The second is to reinforce it, thus compensating for and checking the decay.’ While adopting the notion of reinforcement, we refrain from drawing a link between reinforcement and renovation (renewal). While the former actually involves a link between old and new, the latter does not.
sitz drauf auf dem Haus (‘I am sitting on the house’) (also um + (he)rum ‘around’ (PREP) + ‘around’ (ADV), unter + d(a)runter ‘under’ + ‘below’ etc.). An example illustrating reinforcement where the meaning is not near-homonymous is ne ... pas.

In other cases, an old gram feeds into a new grammaticalizing construction, but we would not speak of reinforcement, because the old gram is not strengthened through further material, but is subordinate to or a component of the new gram. We refer to such cases as SUBMERGENCE. An example is the Hindi postposition me ‘in’ which derives from Sanskrit madhye, the locative singular of madhy- ‘middle’. Here, the old locative morpheme is a component of the new gram, if now having become opaque and phonetically eroded (see Reinöhl forthc.).

Turning to the second level, another formal aspect usually constraining the further development of a source construction pertains to the word classes of the elements making up the source construction. This holds in particular for those positions which are open to further expansion, often called the host class(es) of developing grams. As noted in Himmelmann (2005: 91–92), the functional range of the host class of a gram is generally constrained by the given word classes of a language. For example, a developing auxiliary construction can be expected to expand with regard to its host class until it comprises all verbs of a language, but it would not be expected to also include elements of other word classes. This is, of course, not an absolute boundary for context expansion, as grammaticalization processes may also bring about changes in the word class system, which however is the exception rather than the rule.

Third, there appear to be also more general, structural constraints that may have an impact on new emerging constructions. For example, Schiering (2010) argues that only languages with stress-based phonologies favor cliticization and affixation, while syllable-based and mora-based phonologies disfavor them. This, in turn, means that the formal reduction widely seen as a hallmark of grammaticalization processes tends to stop short of the affixation stage in these languages, with grammatical elements typically being phonologically independent function words or at most weakly cliticized ones. Schiering’s view is corroborated by Bisang in several publications for languages of Southeast Asia that have a syllable-based phonology with tonal distinctions, where function words generally do not tend to cliticize, while they nevertheless may encode rather abstract meanings (e.g. Bisang 2008, 2011).

While the example of the isolating tone languages of Southeast Asia lends some plausibility to the idea that general typological characteristics may influence the trajectory of grammaticalizations, there are many points in need of further scrutiny. In particular, such findings challenge the assumption of a ‘covariation of form and meaning’, i.e. of a far-reaching parallelism of the degree of semantic abstraction and the degree of phonetic reduction (including cliticization) of grams, as proposed by Bybee et al. (1994: 19–21). This assumption would predict that certain types of highly grammaticalized meanings do not occur in languages of the prosodic types studied by Schiering and Bisang. It is not clear that such a prediction is empirically adequate, or rather, the types of meaning explications used in grammaticalization studies do not seem to be finegrained enough to actually test this prediction. Another point in need of further examination is the question whether the factors of relevance here are all related to prosody (or more generally to the phonological system). If so, rather than speaking very broadly of typological constraints on grammaticalization, it would be more precise and productive to develop a theory of prosodic constraints on grammaticalization, which would include the prediction that certain types of grammatical formatives such as affixes only arise when certain prosodic premises are given.

37 There are other syntagmatic variants, e.g. Ich bin im Haus drin(nen) or Ich sitz auf dem Haus d(a)rauf.
4.2 Toward a theory of paradigmatization

Going beyond an extended theory of source determination, we would like to suggest that it is particularly in the domain of paradigmatization that influences of the language system on grammaticalizing processes may be identified. Note that, in a similar way as with the notion of ‘renewal’, paradigmatization (or, alternatively ‘paradigm formation’ or ‘paradigmatic integration’) is often conceived of as a component or correlate of grammaticalization (e.g. Lehmann 2002 [1982], Diewald & Smirnova 2012), rather than as a type of morphosyntactic change distinct from it. For example, Diewald & Smirnova write: ‘[W]e advocate the view that [paradigmatization] can and must be formulated as an essential criterion for differentiating grammaticalization from lexicalization and from other types of semantic change.’ (2012: 112). In a similar vein, Bybee & Dahl claim that paradigmatization is an epiphenomenal effect of the individual grammaticalizations of such constructions which have a similar structure from the beginning and grammaticalize in the same period:

[I]f each gram follows a path of development according to its original meaning, then it develops independently of other grams. It belongs to a structural class if other grams come from structurally similar sources ... undergo grammaticization at approximately the same period of time. Its membership in a structural class, then, is not determined solely by its meaning, but at least in part by chronological coincidence. (Bybee & Dahl 1989: 61, emphasis added)

We agree with Bybee & Dahl that paradigmatization at least sometimes can be accounted for exhaustively as an epiphenomenal result of the grammaticalizations of structurally similar constructions. The example given by Bybee & Dahl are the English modal auxiliaries. These indeed descend from verbal forms that had similar semantic and formal properties from early on. Their grammaticalization in the same period thus automatically led to the formation of a tightly integrated paradigm. Another example of such epiphenomenal paradigmatization are the classes of simple prepositions in modern Romance or Germanic languages. These descend from the set of Proto Indo-European local particles, spatial adverbs with a shared distribution of occurring in juxtaposition with local case forms (see Vincent 1999, Hewson & Bubenik 2006).

In other cases, however, the members of a class of grammatical elements do not share such similar origins, but derive from different syntactic classes and/or periods. A frequent process that plays a role in this regard is analogy, more precisely, the analogical extension of one constructional pattern to another. As is well known and widely documented, analogical change having to do with similarity across forms and structures is a major force in the creation and (re)shaping of grammatical paradigms, both lexical and constructional. In line with much of the literature, we consider analogy a highly potent process in morphosyntactic change which clearly differs from grammaticalization, but may frequently interact with it. Hence, inasmuch as paradigmatization phenomena can be explained by analogy, there is no need for a theory of paradigmatization as a component of a comprehensive theory of grammaticalization. For the examples to be discussed in the remainder of this section, however, we are not sure to what extent they can be fully explained as analogical extensions. If indeed they cannot be explained by (extended) source determination in combination with analogy as traditionally understood, then we believe they point to the need for a theory of paradigmatization.

In order to be clear as to how we understand analogical change, it will be useful briefly to recall how the best-studied ‘proportional’ or ‘four part’ (Hock) analogical change works (cp. Hock 2003, Hill 2007). Here, three of the four variables in an analogical proportion (A is to B as X is to __) are given by the system. Now, a further element Y which stands in a paradigmatic relation to X assumes a form according to the relation that B has to A. Take the example of Old High German lant, singular and plural of ‘land, country’, which is illustrated in Hill (2007: 83–85). Today in modern German, we find Land (SG) vs. Länder (PL). The reanalysis took place in analogy to another inflectional class represented by Old High German blat (SG) ‘leaf’ ~ blättr (PL) > New High German Blatt ~ Blätter.
In this type of example, what we witness is in essence the extension of the host class (= nominal stems) of a particular gram (plural marking pattern). However, note that, in contrast to host class expansion in the course of grammaticalizational change which is semantic as well as distributional, we are here dealing with a predominantly formal change. There is no change in the grammatical meaning opposition singular vs. plural which is already highly grammaticalized. In contrast, and importantly, the following examples all also involve semantic changes.38

Our first example are the Hindi simple postpositions, which descend from at least three different syntactic classes (adverbial, nominal, participial) and grammaticalize at different points of time and thus cannot be straightforwardly accounted for in terms of (extended) source determination. Their paradigmatisation is analyzed in detail in chapter 8 of Reinöhl (forthc.). Here, we only look briefly at the origin of the Hindi postposition par ‘on’ (see chapter 5 of Reinöhl forthc.). Originally, upari, the forerunner form of Hindi par ‘on’, was a zero-valent adverb in Vedic Sanskrit meaning ‘above’, a usage still attested in early Middle Indic Pali, see ex. (12). From younger periods of Sanskrit onwards, upari and a host of other adverbs began to also appear with genitive dependents and with relational semantics. This change from Vedic to younger periods constitutes the ‘post-Vedic genitive shift’. While upari, either in isolation or in apposition with local case forms, used to mean ‘above’ in an absolute sense, it now shifted to locate something ‘on’ something else when combining with a genitive, as illustrated in ex. (13).

12) Pali

\begin{verbatim}
upari bhikkhave ākāse verambā nāma vātā vāyanti
above monk.VOC.PL sky.LOC.SG Veramba.NOM.PL named wind.NOM.PL blow.3PL
\end{verbatim}

‘Oh brothers, in the sky, above, winds blow which are called Veramba.’ (Saṃ II, p. 231)

13) Pali

\begin{verbatim}
seyyathāpi [...] payasotattassa nibbāyamānassa upari santānakaṃ
just_as boiled_milk.GEN.SG cool.PPM.GEN.SG on scum.NOM.SG
hoti evam evaṃ pātur ahosi
become.3SG just_so manifest be.AOR.3SG
\end{verbatim}

‘Even as scum forms on boiled milk that is cooling, so did [the earth] appear.’ (Dīgh III, p. 85)

How did this change occur? Since post-Vedic times, a steeply increasing strategy to form periphrastic expressions of case were relational noun constructions with genitives, e.g. GEN + madhye ‘in the middle of sth.’ which over time became more and more semantically general, relating not only to spatiotemporal containers, but also to abstract ones (e.g. ‘in the middle of my heart’). The formal and semantic shift of upari and other adverbs can be explained as an adaptation to this construction type in specific bridging contexts where constructions were ambiguous both formally and semantically. First, only such adverbs underwent reanalysis that, due to their phonological form, could be mistaken for relational nouns. For example, upari has the phonological structure of a locative of a nominal r-stem. Second, reanalysis took place in such constructions where, due to syncretism between local cases and the genitive, one could not in fact know whether one was dealing with a local case form standing in apposition to upari like the ‘sky’ in ex. (12), or with a genitive depending on upari. Third, formal ambiguity was matched by semantic ambiguity in certain constellations. For example, there are instances where upari combines with a term denoting a raised surface which invites reinterpretation, e.g. ‘snow lies above, at the mountain (LOC’)

---

38 Harris & Campbell (1995: 51, 77ff) discuss what they call EXTENSIONS in syntactic change, which involves what can be considered the analogical transfer of structural patterns. Their focus is primarily on mechanisms bringing about extensions, conceptionalized as the deletion of constraints on rules.
invites a reading as ‘snow lies on the mountain’. The following example is ambiguous on all these levels and thus allows for being assigned a new underlying structure:

14) Pali

\texttt{mahantassa phalaka\textasciimacron so\textasciimacron d\textasciimacrond upanibandhati,}
great.GEN.SG shield.ACC.SG trunk.LOC.SG.F tie.3SG

\texttt{tomaraha\textasciitilde ttho ca puriso upari giv\textasciitilde ya}
holding_a_lance.NOM.SG.M and man.NOM.SG.M above neck.GEN/LOC.SG.F

\texttt{nisinno hoti}
sit_down.PPP.NOM.SG.M be.3SG

‘He ties a shield to the great beast's trunk, a man holding a lance is sitting on his [= an elephant’s] neck.’ (Majjh III, p. 133)

Thus, we are dealing with an adaptation of \textit{upari} and other adverbs to the most frequent and proliferating construction type in the semantic domain of localization. It would appear to be likely that this adaptation at least in part involves (something similar to) an analogical extension (nominal genitive (A) is to relational noun (B) as is Y to local adverb (X)). However, note that we are here dealing with a change that is both formal and semantic, in contrast to analogy as traditionally conceived of. In addition, note that the proportion is considerably strained both on the formal and, in particular, on the semantic side, even though the bridging contexts provide a plausible scenario for the reanalysis to have taken place. It thus remains to be further explored whether analogy is indeed sufficient for a comprehensive account of this kind of change.

Examples of a type similar to the Hindi simple postpositions, while perhaps not the most frequent, are also attested elsewhere. Another such example of a historically heterogeneous paradigm are the Dutch determiners whose layered convergence over time is explored in detail in van de Velde (2010). These cases of tightly integrated functional classes containing members of widely heterogeneous origins are evidence that there are morphosyntactic changes which indeed are not captured by the source determination hypothesis and which possibly need more than analogy to be fully accounted for.

In the case of the remaining example types to be reviewed in this section, it would seem to be even clearer that source determination and analogy are not enough for a complete account. This is the case in what has been called the ‘grammaticalization of zero’. Such cases are perhaps the strongest evidence that contrast indeed has linguistic reality, if less pervasively so than originally assumed in structuralist theories. The grammaticalization of zero may occur in such cases where a semantic distinction used to be unexpressed morphologically and only optionally expressed in a periphrastic type of construction, as for example if a language previously did not mark number on nouns. If, now, an obligatory plural marker develops, for example, it will entail the grammaticalization of zero through contrast, i.e. zero marking acquires the contrasting grammatical value, in this case singular (see Bybee 1988, Bybee et al. 1994: 294–295 for discussion and examples).

In some cases, we may not actually be dealing with a ‘zero morpheme’, but the gram nevertheless enters into an entirely novel contrast. For instance, Bybee (1988) outlines the semantic development of the English simple present in reaction to the grammaticalization of the present progressive. Whereas the simple present used to cover a broad semantic domain including progressive, habitual, generic, and future readings in Old English, it has over time
developed a functional space which in part contrasts with that of the present progressive. As Bybee (1988: 253) points out, only the habitual and generic readings are now available with certain verbs.\(^39\)

The preceding example shows that, through interaction, a construction may actually retract from some of its grammatical usage contexts, which is a principled problem for the source determination hypothesis, which predicts ever more encompassing meaning.\(^40\) This may occur when two (or more) constructions compete for specific meanings. In particular, when a young construction develops meanings that are also expressed by another old construction, it may happen that the old construction is given up in some of these usages. Note that, while the young construction develops as predetermined by its source meaning, it is the old gram (the present tense in the preceding example) whose functional space is ‘curtailed’.

Some authors may choose to view this process as a push chain. However, we would like to emphasize that we are not dealing with a causal relation since both overlap and non-grammaticalization of a certain meaning are equally possible options, as illustrated by the overlap of \textit{will} and \textit{shall} expressing prediction in the 1\(^{st}\) person singular and by languages lacking future grams. Therefore, while such examples lend themselves to a metaphorically loose understanding of a transfer scenario of ‘renewal’, we are not in fact dealing with a transfer of meaning from one construction to another. Instead, it is an epiphenomenal effect of the constellation where one construction develops a meaning (through source determination) that may be optionally given up at some point by another (often, but not necessarily, older) construction.\(^41\)

Note that curtailing may not only lead to the loss of meaning, but also to the creation of new meaning, but in a somewhat different way than in the cases of the grammaticalization of zero noted above. Haspelmath (1998) describes how the grammaticalization of progressive constructions into presents may lead to old presents being lost in main clause, indicative usages. As a result, such old presents may develop subjunctive, future and other ‘niche’ meanings (see Haspelmath 1998 and Bybee et al. 1994: 232–233 for a variety of other languages), a scenario also taken into consideration (but rejected) for the Latin synthetic future in the appendix attached to this paper. Now, an aspect of such curtailing is the absorption of meaning from the new, restricted context. Bybee (1994: 232–233) and Haspelmath (1998) describe how old presents that remained in subjunctive usages but had vanished from indicative, main clause usages, may start to appear again in main clauses, but now encoding non-assertive meanings. This can be observed in Hindi (cp. Haspelmath 1998: 42–43), where the old present can express various non-assertive meanings, while an old progressive construction now encodes indicative meanings (see Bybee et al. 1994: 233–236 for similar examples in other functional domains).\(^42\)

To conclude our very preliminary thoughts on the need for a theory of paradigmatization, interaction between constructions exists in the somewhat trivial, but precise sense that, when a speaker uses one construction, s/he does not at the same time use another one. As a result, when a new construction develops into the functional spectrum

\(^{39}\) There is some evidence that paradigmatic contrast may also play a role in borrowing. See Butt & Ahmed (2011) and chap. 9 in Reinöhl (forth.) on the functionally selective borrowing of ergative \textit{ne} into Hindi/Urdu, where \textit{ne} is borrowed into a functional gap of the postpositional paradigm.

\(^{40}\) It is expected that a grammaticalizing construction at least in part leaves behind its earlier more concrete usages in the course of its development. However, it is not necessarily expected that is loses some of its late-developing grammatical usages, a phenomenon which does occur, however, as illustrated here.

\(^{41}\) A related development is when one gram type specializes for one sub-division of the lexicon, and another gram type for another sub-division. An example is the English past tense, which combines different morphemic strategies marked by a suffix \textit{-ed} vs marked by ablaut.

\(^{42}\) Bybee and Haspelmath differ slightly in their interpretation of this development. Whereas Bybee suggests that the linguistic context of subordinate clauses ‘rubs off’ semantically, Haspelmath argues that non-assertive readings arise not necessarily only in subordinate contexts, but from ‘extralinguistic context … favored by the perfective readings that old presents are given preferentially after the introduction of the new present’ (Haspelmath 1998: 58).
also expressed by another, often older one, the latter might (or might not) be given up over time in this usage. While this process involves the loss of meaning components on the side of the curtailed construction, it may actually also lead to the acquisition of new meanings from the new, restricted context, a process similar to, and perhaps actually identical, to what has been called the grammaticalization of zero. This ‘absorption’ of meaning is clearly not covered by either source determination or analogical extension. This is less clear for the first example type reviewed here, the rise from structurally and diachronically heterogeneous sources of the paradigm of postpositions in Hindi or the determiners in Dutch, which poses particular problems in that here one construction changes both meaning and form at the same time on the model of another construction.

5 Conclusion

In conclusion, we are unable to detect a productive and theoretically viable sense in which the notion of ‘renewal’ may be applied to the analysis of grammatical change. While it is at times used as a loose metaphor and thus without theoretical implications, more often than not authors seem to assume some sort of direct link between an older and a younger construction that resemble each other semantically. Besides the purely descriptive understanding, we identified a ‘recruitment’ and a ‘transfer’ use of ‘renewal’ that turn up in the literature. We reject the ‘recruitment’ use on several grounds empirical and theoretical, first and foremost due to its assumption of the existence of functional deficiency in natural language. In order to scrutinize the ‘transfer’ use, we revisited in detail what is probably the most frequently cited case of ‘renewal’, namely the resemblance between the Latin and French synthetic futures. Their functional similarity, which is indeed striking, can however be fully accounted for also by grammaticalization alone, and specifically by the source determination hypothesis as formulated in Bybee et al. (1994). There is considerable evidence that both constructions descend from semantically closely related modal constructions encoding desire (or volition) and obligation respectively. Thus, they are expected to develop a very similar functional space simply due to their predetermined semantic development. Since this evidence would in theory still allow for a transfer scenario, we also looked at the French periphrastic future aller faire qc which derives from a source construction involving a verb of movement rather than a modal. Even though this is sometimes claimed in publications, we cannot identify clear evidence that the periphrastic future adopts meanings of the synthetic future.

In our opinion and given our empirical investigation into the allegedly prototypical case of ‘renewal’, this notion turns out to be a diffuse concept that has blurred the view on the empirical phenomenon that needs to be accounted for, namely the fact that the grammaticalization of constructions happens within constantly emerging language systems. Thus, we acknowledge and emphasize the need for a revised and considerably extended theory of grammaticalization that takes into account system influences. In the past few decades, grammaticalization researchers have focused on refining the mechanisms and pathways of change in grammaticalization phenomena and the understanding of such phenomena has significantly evolved. What is needed now is an approach to grammaticalization as change in context, where grammaticalizing constructions are shaped by forms and structures they are built up from as well as by constructions they interact with.

As an initial approximation of this vast field of study, we have proposed several domains where we believe that system influences are operative and need to be accounted for. On the one hand, this involves extending the source

---

43 If one construction is lost as the result of such competition with another construction, a result may be functionally induced syncretism (see Baerman 2009: 230). This result is typically brought about when two elements at first started to overlap in some function, in which they become virtually exchangeable. As a result, they may become exchangeable also in other domains which are not strictly speaking on the ‘developmental path’ predetermined by the source meaning of the expanding construction. Whereas formally induced syncretism has been studied extensively, functionally induced syncretism of this sort remains to be explored in detail.
determination hypothesis from meaning to also cover form, ranging from the influence from old grams to prosodic constraints. On the other hand, this comprises interactions between constructions in paradigmatization in a way that cannot be captured properly by the source determination hypothesis, which we identify primarily in the realm of analogical change as well as in interactions hinging on semantic overlap as well as contrast.
Appendix: The morphological and semantic origins of the PIE subjunctive

A note is in order on an alternative scenario that is formulated implicitly or explicitly in some publications on the old IE subjunctive. Morphologically, the subjunctive is formed by means of the thematic vowel -e/-o-, added to a verbal root or stem (depending on inflectional class), to which are added certain sets of person/number suffixes (e.g. Watkins 1969: 59ff, Hill 2009). Apart from the particular forms of the stems (or roots), and some particularities in the person/number suffixes, the thematic vowel is the distinctive marker of the subjunctive. This thematic vowel, in turn, is identical in form to the thematic vowel employed for the present (indicative) stem of the so-called thematic verb classes (and it also appears in the formation of certain aorists). Somewhat simplified, given an athematic class, present indicative forms lack a thematic vowel, whereas present subjunctive forms add one. For example in Vedic, where the thematic vowel appears as an -a-, we find as-ti (be.IND.3SG) vs. as-a-t(i) (be.SUBJ.3SG). On the other hand, given a thematic class, present indicative forms by definition have the thematic vowel, and then lengthen the thematic vowel for subjunctive forms, e.g. bhavati vs. bhavāt(i), which is commonly analyzed as two thematic vowels, i.e. a + a. As a result, the formation of subjunctive forms of athematic classes is structurally the same as the formation of indicative forms of thematic classes, e.g. subjunctive as-a-ti ‘he will/may be’ and indicative bhav-a-ti ‘he is, becomes’. This sameness in form has been taken as evidence that we are dealing with one and the same formation historically. For example, Renou (1932), followed by Watkins (1969) argues that forms marked by the thematic vowel are historically identical and were originally without any modal specification. In recent times, Bozzone (2012) takes up this line of thought and argues based on Bybee et al. (1994), Kuryłowicz (1964) and Haspelmath (1998) that we are here seeing an instance of Bybee et al.’s first aspectual source type, namely an old present (see also Dahl 2013 for a similar argument). In line with the scenario proposed for this source type in crosslinguistic literature, Bozzone argues that old thematic present formations were pushed to the periphery of the language system when new presents entered the system, and the old presents became associated with modal values. This constitutes a counter-proposal to ours that the origin of the subjunctive lies in an agent-oriented modal construction.

We agree with some of the critique raised by Bozzone and she offers an interesting, typologically informed scenario to account for the distribution of the morphologically identical formations across inflectional classes and moods. Nevertheless, we believe that our suggestion of a modal origin is more plausible on the following grounds. First, it is not clear why one and the same morphological formation should on the one hand be pushed to the periphery for some inflectional classes and acquire ‘niche semantics’ as an old present, but remain a productive indicative formation in other classes (i.e. in thematic ones). Above and beyond this specific difficulty with Bozzone’s scenario, the functional space of the PIE subjunctive does not fit the one of an old present. Note that it is not so much the case that old presents ‘actively’ develop predictive meaning, but context endows them with this meaning (see also section 4.2). Bybee et al.’s words, ‘[f]or grams marking perfective and imperfective aspect, future arises as a contextually determined use, and not, as is the case with primary futures, as an evolutionary endpoint in the unfolding development of originally lexical material.’ (1994: 275) Because of this origin, old presents developing into a future ‘tend to be highly generalized, having progressive, habitual, gnomic, and often narrative usages’ (see Bybee et al. 1994: 276). However, this is not what we find in the case of the IE subjunctive. We are dealing with much more specific meanings, namely volitional and intentional ones besides predictive ones. Also

44 Both ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ (i.e. shorter) person/number suffixes are attested.
45 In particular, we share Bozzone’s critical view of earlier attempts at finding a shared functional origin of indicative and subjunctive as an ‘eventuel’ by Renou (1932) and others, which seems to amount to saying that the original form did not have any positive semantic content, modal or otherwise.
46 Bozzone (2012) and Dahl (2013) reinterpret the volitional and intentional readings as ‘hortative’, which would allow for the scenario as an old present, hortative usages being late-developing speaker-oriented moods according to Bybee et al.’s (1991, 1994) findings. However,
distributionally, we find numerous main clause attestations (see Delbrück 1871, Tichy 2006), which shows that the construction by no means survives only in the periphery in the way of old presents (or matches the late-developing return of old presents with irrealis meanings into main clause contexts, outlined in section 4.2).

We conclude that the semantic and distributional characteristics of the subjunctive point to an origin in an agent-oriented modal form, and specifically in the domain of volitionality, as originally proposed by Delbrück (1871), and not in an old present. The morphological connection to present indicative forms of thematic conjugations is of course undeniable, at least on strictly formal grounds. However, we are not aware of a convincing proposal that accounts for the existence of one and the same formation in the indicative and in the subjunctive paradigm. Importantly, note that there is no confusion between forms inside an inflectional class. In general, it is very much a possibility that the formal similarity is due to homonymity rather than to a shared morphological ancestry. In the end, we are only dealing with a morpheme consisting of a single segment (or even only in lengthening in the thematic classes). From a semantic perspective, whatever the formal connections with indicative formations, it seems clear that we are dealing with a semantic source type of agent-oriented modality rather than aspect.

---

47 In fact, Tichy (2004: 101–102) proposes that we may not be dealing with the same morpheme based on instances of uncontracted forms of the thematic vowel and the ‘conjunctive suffix’ (i.e. what others consider to be the second thematic vowel) in Old Avestan.
References


Barceló, Gérard Joan. 2007. “Le(s) future(s) dans les langues romanes: evolution linéaire ou cyclique?”, Cahiers Chronos 16, 47–62.


