Plain and Progressive Futurates in Turkish
Türkçedeki Düz ve Sürerlik Geleceğimsileri

Taylan Akal*
Hacettepe University

Abstract

Futurates denote future time reference without using future markers. In English, there are two types of futurates; plain and progressive. Plain futurates are formed by using present tense, while progressive is formed with progressive marker. Rullmann et al. (2022) differentiate plain and progressive futurates in English stating that plain futurates require schedule, while progressives do not. Based on the mentioned divergence, the present study analyzes the properties of Turkish futurates in terms of schedule requirement. The analysis on the schedule requirement of Turkish futurates are also supported by analyzing the status of nature events, and the availability of future in the past constructions. The outcomes of the study show that there is a contradiction between English and Turkish futurates in terms of schedule interpretation, and compatibility with natural events. While in English, the plain futurate requires schedule, and properly works with natural events; it is the progressive futurate that necessitates schedule, and works fine with nature events in Turkish. Additionally, the analysis on future in the past constructions in Turkish shows that progressive futurates are available with future in the past, while plain futurates are not. This finding also supports the divergence drawn between plain and progressive futurates in Turkish.

Keywords: futurate, aorist, progressive, future tense, future in the past

1. Introduction

Futurate is the interpretation of certain imperfectives in future sense when they relate planned future events (Copley, 2014). Overt future marking is not used in futurates. Sentences 1 and 2 given below are instances of futurate readings from English:

1.a. The Red Sox play the Yankees tomorrow.
1.b. # The Red Sox defeat the Yankees tomorrow.

2.a. The Red Sox are playing the Yankees tomorrow.
2.b. # The Red Sox are defeating the Yankees tomorrow. (Copley, 2002)

When the sentences given above are compared, it is seen that the examples 1.a and 2.a are more acceptable than examples 1.b and 2.b, since the "a" sentences include the meaning of a plannable event, "b" sentences do not. However, the same oddness of interpretations of "b" sentences are not observed in sentence 3 given below, even if the same predicate is used:

3. The Red Sox will defeat the Yankees tomorrow. (Copley, 2002)

The reason apparently seems to stem from the aspectual markers. Copley (2002) states that in English, both simple (except perfectives) and progressive forms have futurate readings. Rullmann et al. (2022) classify these two types of futurates as "progressive futurate" (*…are playing…*) and "plain futurate" (*…play…*), proposing that these two kinds of futurates convey different meanings. Plain futurates are considered to presuppose the existence of a schedule, while this is not the case for progressive futurates. Rullmann et al. (2022) also state that, these

two types of futurates are regarded to relay approximately similar meanings or not being isolated strictly in the literature, which analyzes futurates. For instance, Goodman (1973) puts forward a comparison of futurates with future sentences, and tries to isolate the semantic features of futurate class as a whole. In another study on the related phenomenon, Vetter (1973) criticizes Lakoff (1971, in Vetter, 1973), which puts forward a principle on the deletion of "will". In Lakoff (1971)'s formulation, "will" may be deleted in case the event is presupposed to be certain in speaker's perspective. Vetter (1973) hypothesizes that the structures in which "will" is deleted, a planned event is entailed, and analyzed the issue through present tense and progressive aspect structures.

1.1. Plain and Progressive Futurates

Rullmann et al. (2022)'s analysis, which has been supported by empirical evidence, proposes two kinds of futurate structures (the plain and the progressive futurates) each of which convey different meanings in English. Their major proposal is that plain futurates, but not progressive ones, require a schedule. For instance, in the set of sentences given below, it is observed that while the progressive futurate in 4.a is acceptable, the plain futurate in 4.b cannot follow the related context sentence properly. This is considered to be due to the fact that the preceding context does not provide a schedule for block parties in 4, but just indicates the existence of a plan for a one-time event:

4. *Context: The speaker's street has decided to have its first ever block party. The speaker is letting their friend know about it.*
4.a. Our street is *holding* a block party on March 25th. (acceptable)
4.b. Our street *holds* a block party on March 25th. (degraded)

However, in 5 below, the context sentence includes a schedule, which makes the plain futurate reading acceptable:

5. *Context: In the speaker's neighborhood, every street holds a block party at some point, and there is a schedule for the parties. The speaker tells their neighbor*:
5.a. Our street is *holding* its block party on March 25th.
5.b. Our street *holds* its block party on March 25th.

It is stated that plain futurate is compatible in contexts, which indicate a schedule of future events not just a plan for a single event. In that respect, the definition of schedule may need description through Rullmann et al. (2022)'s perspective. They define a schedule as a matrix of information concerning future events, which can be represented via lines and columns in a table marked with (for instance) chores to be carried out and matched with related dates and the assigned staff member. Their definition of schedule includes a physical or mental representation that makes a set of answers available to multiple wh-questions about future events. For instance, the table given below answers the question given in 6:

6. Who does which chore on which day?

Table.1 A schedule for chores

	Dec.8	*Dec.15*	*Dec.22*
Vacuuming	Ann	Bob	Cam
Laundry	Bob	Cam	Ann
Dishes	Cam	Ann	Bob

(from Rullmann et al., 2022)

They indicate that a plain futurate presupposes the existence of a (unique) salient schedule in the context, however, it is further mentioned that a plain futurate is not only licensed by any matrix of information. Although the definition of a schedule as a predetermined future event includes an intentional planning by humans, Rullmann et al. (2022) state that plain futurates are compatible with relating natural events, which are pre-determined such as sunrise or sunset:

7. The sun rises tomorrow morning at 6.30.

The same phenomenon is labelled by Copley (2014) as "natural futurates", which are considered to be exceptions to the general definition of futurates presupposing a plannable eventuality. It is further stated that English natural futurates are not available in progressive form.

Moreover, they propose that, what is not specified for plain futurates beforehand is the fact that the underlying schedule should include a non-trivial matrix with multiple dimensions like the one given in table 1 above.

1.2. The Aim of the Study

Turkish aorist and progressive have widely been analyzed through their semantic and morphological features in previous studies. Besides the common features that have been proposed, it is also possible to observe that studies sometimes reach up to contradictory outcomes in interpreting their grammatical and semantic functions. Even, the status of them in terms of being either aspect or tense marker has been a topic of discussion in the previous literature. In the following sections, the analyses on Turkish aorist and progressive will be summarized, mostly concentrating on their "future" indications since the main objective of the present study is to identify and analyze these two markers through "futurate" interpretations they have, especially concentrating on requiring a "schedule" interpretation, due to the fact that schedule requirement is a major point of distinction between plain and progressive futurates in English (Rullmann et. al., 2022). The present study will try to answer if the same requirement is also observed in Turkish futurates. Moreover, following Copley (2014), the compatibility of natural events with Turkish futurates will also be analyzed. This is due to the fact that, in English, the availability of plain and progressive futurates with natural events signals a distinction. If a similar distinction is also observed in Turkish, this will contribute to the understanding of classification of Turkish futurates. Overall, the present study aims at contributing to Turkish literature by analyzing, defining and classifying Turkish futurates, which have not been studied beforehand.

In the following sections, firstly, the previous analyses and traditional definitions of aorist and progressive in Turkish are given, then the two markers will be analyzed and discussed in terms of their "futurate interpretations" with the above-given considerations, and finally, the study will be concluded.

2. Aorist and Progressive Markers in Turkish

2.1. Aorist in Turkish

It is possible to observe various definitions and analyses of Turkish aorist in the related literature. For instance, Yavaş (1979) states that Turkish aorist "*-(E)r*" indicates mood or aspect more than it relates tense, and so, analyzing Turkish aorist through a timeline of events would mislead the argument to an insufficient interpretation. In the same study, aorist is

broadly defined as having an effect of characterizing the entity in question in comparison to progressive, which is considered to indicate a certain behavior of the entity. Kornfilt (1997) describes Turkish aorist as both indicator of a general present tense and as an aspectual marker relating habitual actions. Jendraschek (2011) states that in classifying the marker "-(E)r", the most common term that is used is aorist, and further indicates that the term "aorist", besides being commonly used, is also a controversial label due to the inexplicitness of its status as a tense or aspect marker. Göksel and Kerslake (2005), analyze aorist under the scope of "modality". They propose four types of generalizations expressed by the aorist as, scientific and moral axioms, normative or prescriptive statements, generic statements about the characteristic qualities or behavior of a class and finally the statements about the characteristic qualities or behavior of an individual. Göksel and Kerslake (2005) give the following examples for each of these generalizations:

8. İki, iki daha dört eder. *(scientific and moral axioms)*
   two two more four make-AOR
   "*Two and two make four.*"

9. Burada musluk suyu içilmez. *(normative or prescriptive statements)*
   here tap water-POSS drink-PASS-NEG-AOR
   "*One doesn't drink the tap water here.*"

10. Kaplumbağa yavaş yürür. *(generic statements about the characteristics of a class)*
    tortoise slow walk-AOR
    "*A tortoise walks slowly.*"

11. Ali sigara içmez. *(the statements about the characteristic of an individual)*
    Ali cigarette smoke-NEG-AOR
    "*Ali doesn't smoke.*"

Jendraschek (2011) favors using the term "dispositive" for the functions of Turkish "-(E)r". In supporting this claim, it is stated that the morpheme "-(E)r" relates the following four basic expressions. First, habitual repeated actions or events, and universal truths; second, the inherent properties of the subject referent including inherent qualities or long-term behavior patterns, which are related to the disposition taken by the subject; third, virtual situations, ability and imaginable events, and finally, the subject's voluntary actions in future (like commitments, or promises) are expressed and further stated that the actions are not planned or predetermined. What is important on this point is that, by using the term dispositive, the disposition of the subject referent is emphasized.

2.2. Progressive Aspect in Turkish

Progressive aspect is marked with *"-(I)yor"* in Turkish. Göksel and Kerslake (2005) define it as the indicator of an ongoing situation at a particular point in time, and classify the marker under imperfective aspect. Further, they also indicate that *"-(I)yor"*, as an imperfective marker, occurs with both progressive and habitual meaning as given in the following sentences:

12.a. Şu anda ne yapıyorsunuz? (*Progressive event*)
    This moment-LOC what do-IMPF-2Plr
    "*What are you doing at the moment?*"
12.b. Yemek yiyoruz. (*Progressive event*)
    Meal eat-IMPF-1Pl
    "*We are having dinner.*"

13. Sen   Ömeri   benden   daha   iyi   tanıyorsun (*Progressive state*)
    You   Ömer-ACC I-ABL   more   well   know-IMPF-2Sg
    "You know Ömer better than me."

As it is observable through the above-given examples, progressive aspect indicates a specific situation, which is incomplete. This situation may be both a dynamic event (12.a and 12.b) or a static state (13). In regard to the reference point in time, it is an ongoing situation. On the matter of habitual aspect related by the same morpheme, a situation is still incomplete, however, this time it is in the sense of a recurrent pattern as given in item 14 below:

14. Fatma   genellikle   Ankaraya   otobüsle   gidiyor (*Habitual*)
    Fatma   usually   Ankara-DAT bus-INS   go-IMPF-3Sg.
    "Fatma usually goes to Ankara by bus."
                        (*Items 12.a, 12.b, 13, and 14 are taken from Göksel and Kerslake (2005)*).

Kornfilt (1997) labels the same marker as continuous aspect of a non-stative verb, along with glossing it as a present progressive marker in some examples in the same study. Also, Cinque (2001), which analyzes the order of tense, aspect, and modality morphemes in Turkish, classifies *"-(I)yor"* as progressive aspect suffix. Besides the above-given classifications, Jendraschek (2011)[1] states that, *"-(I)yor"* has also been labelled as indicating tense several times in the literature by referring to Ersen-Rasch (2004), Çakır (2009), and Lewis (1967). Erguvanlı Taylan (2001) also states that *"-(I)yor"* is analyzed as a general imperfective aspect marker expressing mainly present tense when it is not followed by any tense/aspect marker. It is further indicated that in the mentioned setting, a future interpretation may be derived out of *"-(I)yor."*

3. Analysis and Discussion

In this section, the futurate functions of aorist (plain futurate) and progressive (progressive futurate) markers in Turkish will be presented referring to previous literature, and be discussed in terms of their futurate readings especially considering the framework of schedule interpretation. In this way, the arguments on the differences between English plain and progressive futurates will be discussed asking if these differences are also operational in Turkish, and if a similar divergence can also be drawn between plain and progressive futurates in Turkish. Thus, the universality of the claim will be questioned. This section is comprised of three subsections. In 3.1 the plain and progressive futurates in Turkish will be detailed, in 3.2 the schedule interpretation of them will be analyzed. And finally, 3.3 will analyze the futurate interpretations of future in the past constructions in Turkish.

3.1. Plain and Progressive Futurates in Turkish

As it is exemplified in the above-given sections, the tense and aspectual properties of both the aorist and progressive markers in Turkish are comprehensively analyzed in the literature. Mostly, the classification of these two markers as either indicating tense or aspect, along with their semantic functions have been put in the center of the previous studies. In this section, the discussions on the futurate functions of these markers will be given and in accordance with the aim of the present study, the analysis of the markers will be carried out concentrating on the schedule interpretation, and the availability with natural events. Following Rullmann et al.

---

[1] See Jendraschek (2011) for a detailed discussion on the aspectual or tense features of "-(I)yor" in Turkish.

(2022)'s classification of plain and progressive futurates, a similar one will be pursued in order to point out if the difference between plain and progressive futurates specified in English can be extended towards Turkish futurates, and a possible universality claim will be sought for.

Yavaş (1979) states that the aorist is used to refer to future events in Turkish very often. Item 15 is taken from Yavaş (1979):

> 15. Kahvelerimizi   içip   derse   başlarız.
>   Coffee-PL-POSS-ACC   drink-ADV   lesson-DAT   start-AOR-3Plr.
>   "*We'll drink our coffee and then start the lesson.*"

Yavaş (1979) indicates that, the above-given sentence can also be formed with "*-EcEk*", which is the future marker in Turkish. However, the use of the future marker creates an important difference in the interpretations of the sentences in comparison to the ones formed with aorist. In Yavaş (1979)'s terms, while the use of aorist includes "willingness" and "willingness plus intention" on the subject's side, future marker is more "neutral" and "bereft of modal connotations." For instance, while in sentence 15, the "intention and volition" of the person to begin the lesson after drinking coffee is expressed, the same structure with "*-EcEk*" would indicate the starting moment of the lesson is a predetermined/planned future event including "some sort of definiteness." In that respect, the aorist has a "modal function" indicating "volition." Yavaş (1979) further analyzes the "volition" function of aorist by comparing it with progressive through questions asking for information and questions presenting offer. It is stated that, by using question form with the aorist, it is possible to create ambiguity between "presenting an offer" or "asking question for information." However, if the sole intention of the speaker is to ask for information, the progressive form can be used, since it does not create an "offer" interpretation. So, it is stated that the aorist in Turkish has both an aspectual and a modal function, and further concluded that it would be better if one semantic category could be specified to define all the different functions of aorist.

Kornfilt (1997) states that the aorist form in Turkish has the future tense function, mostly in the sense of a "promise," which is given in item 16 below. However, this sense of promise is not as strong as the "commitment" and "definiteness" indicated by the regular future tense suffix, which is also exemplified in item 17. The following examples are taken from Kornfilt (1997):

> 16. Yarın   sana   uğrarım.
>   Tomorrow   you-DAT   drop by-AOR-1Sg
>   "*Tomorrow I will drop by at your place.*" (*Actually: "Tomorrow I drop by at your place."*)

> 17. Yarın   sana   uğrayacağım.
>   Tomorrow   you-DAT   drop by-FUT-1Sg
>   "*Tomorrow I will drop by at your place.*"

Kanık (2015) studies the functions of Turkish aorist and progressive through spoken corpus analysis. In the study, eleven functions of the aorist have been identified. Among those, "assumptions" and "commitments" are found to comprise the most common uses of all with a percentage of 55.82%. Kanık (2015) further indicates that these functions entail indefinite future meanings rather than present. This is in harmony with Jendraschek (2011)'s classification of the functions of Turkish aorist. Jendraschek (2011) defines the fourth function as the future voluntary actions of the subject such as "commitments" and "promises." These actions are considered to be unplanned and non-predetermined.

Just like the future function of aorist, the progressive aspect marker in Turkish is also stated to have a future function. Kornfilt (1997) indicates that the present progressive form may also be used with future function as given in 18 below:

18. Yarın   işten   sonra   sana   geliyorum
    Tomorrow   work-ABL   after   you-DAT come-PROG-1Sg
    "*Tomorrow I'm coming to your place after work.*"

Moreover, Jendraschek (2014) proposes a strong claim on Turkish tense and aspectual system stating that the label "future tense" is improper for Turkish since the prospective aspect and present tense give the future time reference in combination. Since the definition of a futurate is denoting future tense without using future tense marker, it seems reasonable to state that the aorist and progressive in Turkish can be classified as futurates in Turkish. Considering this, in harmony with the aim of the present paper, the following subsections will analyze and discuss the potential differences between plain and progressive futurates in Turkish.

3.2. Schedule in Turkish plain and progressive futurates

Comparing plain and progressive futurates in English, the main assumption of Rullman et al. (2022) is that, while plain futurates require schedule, progressive futurates do not. If the status of aorist in Turkish is analyzed adopting a similar perspective, it is possible to observe that the plain futurate (which is implemented via aorist in Turkish) does not seem to show a similar pattern with English plain futurate in terms of including schedule. For instance, item 19 given below should include a pre-planned event, since the context of the sentence necessitates a scheduled event as planes follow a schedule to take off. However, the sentence does not sound compatible with a future interpretation, or at least sounds odd, even if it begins with the time adverbial "yarın (*tomorrow*)", which directly indicates future time:

19. Yarın   uçak   9'da   kalkar.
    Tomorrow   plane   at nine   take off-AOR
    "*Tomorrow, the plane takes off at 9.*"

It is apparent that the future interpretation in 19 above is not acceptable, or at least sounds odd in such kind of a context, which includes a pre-planned schedule for an event like a plane to take off at a certain time. In its core sense, the interpretation has "volition" or "assumption," but these interpretations do not fit into the related context since it includes an already set up calendar for a flight to take place. The interpretation of item 19 given above seems like to present harmony with Kanık (2015)'s "assumption" function, which is considered to be among the top-rated functions of aorist. Also, it is possible to form a relatedness with Yavaş (1979)'s "willingness" function.

However, when the same sentence setting is constructed with progressive futurate, it perfectly involves a scheduled event interpretation for a plane to take off at a pre-determined time:

20. Yarın   uçak   9'da   kalkıyor.
    Tomorrow   plane   at nine   take off-PROG
    "*Tomorrow, the plane is taking off at 9.*"

The analysis of the above-given sentences (19 and 20) shows a contradictory finding with the status of plain and progressive futurates in English in terms of involvement of a schedule. It is obvious that, for Turkish futurates, the involvement of schedule functions in the opposite direction of English. In English, the plain futurate requires schedule, in Turkish the progressive

one does. To further up the analysis, it would be beneficial to have a look at Copley (2002)'s proposal on the difference between simple and progressive futurates. Sentences 21.a and 21.b given below are taken from Copley (2002):

21.   a. Is Joe going skydiving tomorrow?
        b. Does Joe go skydiving tomorrow?

Copley (2002) states that while 21.a, which is formed with progressive futurate, asks "if Joe's going for skydiving tomorrow is provided by the plan," 21.b, which is constructed with simple futurate, presupposes that "Joe to go skydiving is already provided by the plan," and the real question is "if tomorrow is the day for the plan." Shortly, in 21.a the interpretation is "asking if there is a plan or not," and in 21.b the interpretation to be derived is, "there is already a plan for skydiving, but is it for tomorrow?" However, if we have a look at the case in Turkish, a similar pattern seems like to present a totally different outcome. Sentence 22.a, which is given below, is formed with progressive futurate. The interpretation of the sentence is "is there a plan for Ahmet to go skiing tomorrow, and if there is a plan, will Ahmet go with the plan or not?":

22.a.   Yarın   Ahmet   kayağa   gidiyor   mu?
          Tomorrow   Ahmet   skiing-DAT   go- PROG   Q
          "*Is Ahmet going skiing tomorrow?*"

On the contrary, in 22.b, that is formed with (aorist) plain futurate, the question includes an "expectancy" or "guess," but does not mention any existing or potential plan or schedule for skiing, which seems to create a divergence between the English examples proposed by Copley (2002) given above:

22.b.   Yarın   Ahmet   kayağa   gider   mi?
          Tomorrow   Ahmet   skiing-DAT   go- AOR   Q
          "*Does Ahmet go skiing tomorrow?*"

In relation to these sentence sets, there is one more point that needs clarification. In sentences 22.a, and 22.b given above, the scope of the adverb phrase does not change in parallel with the alternation of plain and progressive futurates, as it does in English examples. The scope of the adverb phrase can be manipulated by changing the position of the adverb phrase in Turkish (wide-sentential scope, or narrow-VP scope), which is beyond the discussion of the present paper.

The observation presented above also seems like to correlate between Göksel and Kerslake (2005), stating that *–(I)yor,* which is an imperfective aspect marker, relates future reference when scheduled or fixed events are being mentioned. It is further indicated in the same study that, in expressing planned future events, with the use of *–(I)yor,* the speaker's sturdy confidence about the planned event that will take place in the planned schedule is indicated. For instance, in item 23 given below (taken from Göksel and Kerslake, 2005), a planned event is referred:

23. Yarın   Londra'ya   gidiyoruz.
     Tomorrow   London-DAT   go-PROG-3Plr
     "*We're going to London tomorrow.*"

As it is exemplified above, in Turkish, the divergence between plain and progressive futurates in terms of requiring schedule, seems like to function differently in comparison to English

futurates, which are defined by Rullman et al. (2022). For the predetermined events that are compatible with futurates, Copley (2014) asserts that the plan in futurates has a similar value to the director's commitment for the plan to be realized. The term "director" here refers to someone with the ability to determine if the outcome will take place or not; or in other terms, the "director" may simply be the subject of the sentence. It is indicated that while futurates presuppose a plannable eventuality, there is an instance of exception to this generalization that comes from the natural events. This exception also creates a divergence between plain and progressive futurates in English. According to Copley (2014), natural futurates are not convenient with progressive, while they are compatible with simple present tense (plain futurates) as shown in 24.a and 24.b (taken from Copley, (2014)) below:

24.a. The sun rises tomorrow at 6:30.
24.b. ?The sun is rising tomorrow at 6:30.

The unavailability of 24.b is claimed to be bound to the absence of a "director" in natural events by Copley (2014). This observation is also supported by Rullman et al. (2022) stating that pre-determined natural events like the timetable for sunrise can be indicated via plain futurates in English.

When a similar analysis is carried out on Turkish futurates with natural events (e.g. sunrising), the second contradictory finding between English and Turkish futurates is observed. The verbs in sentences 25.a and 25.b are inflected with progressive aspect marker and aorist marker, respectively. When the sentences are examined, it is possible to observe that while 25.a (formed with progressive aspect marker) is compatible with a futurate interpretation, 25.b, which is formed with aorist marker, sounds inconvenient if a future interpretation is to be derived:

25.a. Takvime   göre   yarın   güneş   7:05'te   doğuyor.
      Calendar-DAT   according-to tomorrow sun   7:05-at   rise- PROG
      "According to the calendar, the sun is rising at 7:05 tomorrow."
25.b. ?Takvime   göre   yarın   güneş   7:05'te   doğar.
      Calendar-DAT   according-to tomorrow sun   7:05-at   rise- AOR
      "According to the calendar, the sun rises at 7:05 tomorrow."

While the progressive futurate interpretation sounds compatible with the natural event (sunrising), the plain futurate sounds odd with the same event. The outcome seems to be contradictory with the observation carried out on English (Copley, 2014; Rullman et al., 2022), in which the plain futurate is compatible with natural events, while the progressive one is not. Copley (2014) explains the unavailability of progressive futurate with natural events in English with the absence of a director in natural events although the time of the sunrising is certain due to the natural process.

The observations and comparisons carried out on progressive and plain futurates in English and Turkish so far seem like to indicate a clear discrepancy between the functions of plain and progressive futurates in these two languages. The plain futurates in English are observed to require schedule (Rullman et al. 2022) and the natural events being compatible with plain futurates, but not with progressive one (Copley, 2014). However, in Turkish, it is observed that not the plain futurates, but the progressive ones require schedule (see items 19, 20, 22.a, and 22.b above). Besides this, in terms of natural events, progressive futurates in English seem to be incompatible with them, while plain futurates are appropriate. However, the examination

with natural events in Turkish proposes a different outcome (items 25.a, and 25.b). In order to expand the analysis on the divergence between English and Turkish futurates, observing another function of progressive and aorist marker given by Yavaş (1979) may be beneficial. It is stated in Yavaş (1979) that although the aorist in Turkish is used to relate future events frequently, it brings together an indication of "willingness" and "willingness plus intention." The observation is also enlarged with another difference between aorist and progressive in terms of making "offers" and "invitations." For instance, the interpretation of sentence 26 is a certain offer (taken from Yavaş, 1979):

29. Bir   bardak   daha   çay   içer   misiniz?
    One   glass   more   tea   drink-AOR Q-2Plr
    "*Would you like to have another cup of tea?*"

It is further indicated that an ambiguity may arise between an offer and a real question asking for information when aorist is used. However, the same ambiguity is not observed when the same structure is used with progressive marker (see the items 30, 31.a, 31.b, and 32, which are taken from Yavaş, 1979):

30. Jambon   yer   misin?
    Ham   eat-AOR   Q-2Sg
    "*Do you eat ham?*"

Yavaş (1979) proposes that sentence 30 may both be interpreted as a yes/no question and an offer. However, if the only aim of the speaker is to demand information from the interlocutor, the progressive form is used, which produces only the question interpretation, as given in 31 below:

31. Jambon   yiyor   musun?
    Ham   eat-PROG   Q-2Sg
    "*Do you eat ham?*"

As the above-given items show, while the aorist form can cause ambiguity with both a question and an offer interpretation, progressive form does not cause an ambiguity, since the only interpretation that can be derived is a question. According to Yavaş (1979) the reason of the difference between these two forms is related to the volition function of the aorist, which is explained by the fact that people make an offer by asking the hearer's willingness to perform an action.

In the light of the previous findings and the above-given analysis of Turkish aorist and progressive forms, it is possible to state that the difference between these two markers, which create futurate readings may be related to the volition function of aorist, which is not observed in progressive. Progressive futurates in Turkish is compatible with natural events and with scheduled events, however it is the vice versa for English. In Turkish, it seems like the aorist form, with all of its functions, including the non-past indication, is used for future events but in a different manner from progressive. Progressive futurates in Turkish are used with scheduled events, and natural events when there is certain data about the realization of the natural event (e.g. a previously provided weather forecast) since progressive in Turkish includes a sense of certainty about the upcoming events, which is very understandable with scheduled events and already expected natural events. As mentioned before, Copley (2014) states that progressive futurates in English do not work properly with natural events because there is no director in natural events, however for the case in Turkish, it has been shown above that the natural

events work better with the progressive marker than they do with the aorist (plain futurates). It seems that, the reason of this is the fact that the progressive form provides a stronger evidentiality in comparison to aorist in Turkish. Kanık (2015), which studies the functions of aorist and progressive markers through corpus analysis in Turkish, states that the "assumption" function come in the first place with the highest frequency for the aorist marker. This observation is in harmony with the analysis pursued in the present chapter. The plain futurate, which is formed with aorist does not work properly with scheduled events in Turkish because a schedule indicates a sense of certainty for a future event, however, the interpretation brought by aorist includes some sense of assumption and volition, each of which does not necessitate schedule or does not sound compatible with a schedule at all. So, it is available to state that scheduled or expected events due to previous data do not take place among the functions of the aorist in Turkish. In English, plain futurates require schedule and they can also be used with natural events. However, it is observed that, in Turkish, it is the progressive form, which requires schedule and which is coherent with natural events.

3.3. Futurates in the Past in Turkish

One final evidence on the divergence between plain and progressive futurates in Turkish comes from structures relating future in the past as detailed below:

> 32. İşim   çıkmasaydı   yarınki   yemeğe   gelirdim.
> Something-POSS come up-NEG-COND-PST tomorrow-ADJ dinner-DAT   come-AOR-PST-1Sg
> *"If something did not come up, I would attend the dinner tomorrow." (literal)*
> *"If something did not come up, I would like to attend the dinner tomorrow."*

The interpretation to be derived out of sentence 32 is closer to volition more than a scheduled event. The speaker does not mention about an already set schedule including the participation for the dinner, but just implies a voluntary act on the speaker's side to join the dinner if something unexpected did not come up. As it is seen, the marker used in inflecting the verb is aorist (plain futurate). The absence of schedule in 32 is clearer to observe when it is compared with sentence 33, the verb of which has the progressive futurate:

> 33. İşim   çıkmasaydı   yarınki   yemeğe   geliyordum.
> Something-POSS come up-NEG-COND-PAST tomorrow-ADJ dinner-DAT   come-AOR-PST-1Sg
> *"If something did not come up, I was attending the dinner tomorrow."*

In sentence 33, the interpretation includes the existence of a scheduled event but due to an unexpected situation it has been cancelled on the speaker's side. The same pattern is also strongly observed with events, which are genuinely scheduled. As it is observed in 34 and 35 below, a flight has already been set in a certain time but has been cancelled due to weather conditions:

> 34.?Fırtına yüzünden uçuş iptal   olmasaydı   uçak 9'da   kalkardı.
>   Storm because of flight cancel be-NEG-COND-PAST plane at nine take off-AOR-PAST
>   *"If the flight was not cancelled due to the storm, the plane would take off at 9."*

Sentence 34 sounds odd in Turkish. If it does not sound odd to some Turkish speakers, at least it does not sound compatible with a scheduled event that would take place if unexpected conditions did not emerge. The use of plain futurate adds a sense of volition to the broad meaning of the sentence, however, the volition interpretation does not sound to be properly obtained, or at least not in harmony with the context given in 34, which as a result, causes a

whimsical interpretation. On the contrary, when the sentence is formed with the progressive marker instead of aorist in the same context, the oddness recedes, as shown in 35:

35. Fırtına yüzünden uçuş iptal olmasaydı uçak 9'da kalkıyordu.
    Storm because of flight cancel be-NEG-COND-PAST plane at nine take off-PROG-PAST
    "If the flight was not cancelled due to the storm, the plane was taking off at 9."

Items 32, 33, 34, and 35 include future in the past. As they show, if a certain schedule is already set in the context, the futurate that is compatible with the meaning should be formed with progressive marker in Turkish. In the same context, the aorist either provides volition (item 32), or sounds odd (item 34).

As a final remark, it can be stated that analyzing Turkish futurates by comparing their properties with English futurates may provide some intriguing data on a crosslinguistic perspective, especially considering the fact that there is not a great number of crosslinguistic studies on the topic. Still, a very recent study by He (2024) on Mandarin Chinese futurates may provide some understanding on the issue. In the mentioned study, Mandarin futurates are compared to English simple futurates. This is due to the fact that only simple futurates occur in Mandarin, which is a point of divergence from both English and Turkish. He (2024) signals a similarity between English and Mandarin simple futurates. For instance, it is stated that simple futurates are proper with weather verbs in Mandarin because they can be predicted depending on weather forecast, which is scientifically reliable. Also, simple futurates in Mandarin presuppose the existence of a plan that is relevant to the assertion. Just like in English, simple futurates in Mandarin are not properly used with events that cannot be scheduled, although it is further indicated that Mandarin is more flexible with weather predicates in comparison to English. As mentioned previously in the present study, the plain futurate is observed to be not compatible with weather verbs in Turkish. This is a point of variation between Mandarin and Turkish. Moreover, by considering He (2024)'s statement about Mandarin's being more flexible with weather verbs than English is, may help to derive a gradual ranking among Mandarin, English and Turkish plain futurates with weather verbs; from the most flexible one (Mandarin), to the one that does not allow the construction at all (Turkish). He (2024) also mentions a point of variation between Mandarin and English plain futurates. Mandarin futurates are indicated to be proper with one-off plans unlike English futurates. Overall, it is assumed that the divergences between Mandarin and English futurates signal that the limitations on simple futurates vary in languages that do not own a contrasting progressive form for future time reference.

Another study that may provide some contribution to a crosslinguistic understanding of futurates is Rivero (2009), which compares Slavic involuntary state constructions to English futurates and Spanish modal "imperfectos." Besides the similarities among them, Rivero (2009) indicates that English and Slavic constructions differ in terms of denoting plans. While, English futurates denote plans, Slavic involuntary state constructions do not. This outcome is interpreted by referring to the concept of director proposed by Copley (2002). It is asserted that English futurates may involve director due to the nominative marked subject or due to the relevant context. However, Slavic involuntary state constructions lack a director because of the dative marked subject, the formal composition of which causes an incompatibility with the features attested to a director regardless of contextual or linguistic definition. The fact that Slavic involuntary state constructions do not denote plan shows harmony with the analysis on Turkish plain futurates that is carried out in the present study. However, the reason of the

unavailability of plan in Slavic futurates is related to lacking a director due to the dative marked subject, which is not the case for Turkish. Although the reasons are different, the status of plain futurates with being noncompatible with plan/schedule seems to be a point of convergence between Slavic and Turkish.

4. Conclusion

In the present study the plain (formed with aorist) and progressive (formed with progressive) futurates are analyzed in Turkish. In the analysis of these two types of futurates, majorly Rullmann et al. (2022)'s proposal on English futurates has been taken into consideration. Rullmann et al. (2022) state that in English, the plain futurate requires the existence of a schedule in future interpretation, while progressive futurates do not require schedule. The analysis of Turkish futurates revealed that, while progressive futurates require schedule, plain futurates do not. This outcome is in the opposite direction with English futurates. In addition to the schedule interpretation of futurates, Copley (2014)'s proposal on the existence of a director in English futurates is analyzed through the natural events in Turkish. Copley (2014) states that natural events are compatible with plain futurates, while they are not convenient with progressive, and explains this divergence by the absence of a director in natural events. The mentioned phenomenon is also analyzed for Turkish futurates in the present study. In harmony with the previous finding on schedule interpretation, it is observed that also for natural events, the plain and progressive futurates work differently in Turkish. While, the progressive marker is compatible with indicating future interpretation on natural events, the plain futurate sounds odd within the same construction. This outcome is due to the potential certainty with natural events, which are observable. So, it supports the observation that progressive futurates in Turkish both indicate schedule and already expected events. In the present study, one final analysis was carried out on futurates in the past. The observation on futurate structures in the past showed that the futurate interpretation for future in the past is compatible with progressive marker in Turkish, which includes the sense of the existence of a schedule. However, when the same structure is constructed with plain futurate, it has the sense of volition, which means it does not indicate future, or it sounds odd as a whole. As summarized above, the analyses carried out in the present study show that the formation of futurates in Turkish does not follow a similar pattern with the ones in English when the two futurate markers (aorist and progressive) are comparatively analyzed. It is the progressive futurate in Turkish, which requires schedule, is compatible with natural events, and relates future interpretation with an implication of schedule in future in the past constructions.

References

Cinque, G. (2001). A Note on Mood, Modality, Tense and Aspect Affixes in Turkish. In E. E. Taylan (Ed.), *The Verb in Turkish*. (pp. 47-59). John Benjamins B. V.

Copley, B. L. (2002). The Semantics of the Future. (*PhD Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy*).

Copley, B. L. (2014). "Causal Chains for Futurates". In De Brabanter, P., M. Kissine, and S. Sharifzadeh (Eds.), *Future Times, Future Tenses.* (pp. 72-86). Oxford Academic. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199679157.003.0004

Çakır, H. (2009). Grammatik Kurz & Bündig. Türkisch. Pons.

Erguvanlı Taylan, E. (2001). On the relation between temporal/aspectual adverbs and the verb form in Turkish. In E. E. Taylan (Ed.), *The Verb in Turkish*. (pp. 97-128). John Benjamins.

Ersen-Rasch, M. I. (2004). Türkische Grammatik für Anfänger und Fortgeschrittene. Second edition. Max Hueber.

Goodman, F. (1973). On the semantics of futurate sentences. *Ohio State University working papers in linguistics 16*, (pp. 76-89). Ohio State University.

Göksel, A. and Kerslake, C. (2005). Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar. Routledge.

He, Y. (2024). The Semantics of Mandarin Futurates. *Language and Linguistics, 25*(2), 234-269.

Jendraschek, G. (2011). A Fresh Look at the Tense-Aspect System of Turkish. *Language Research*, *47*(2), 245-270.

Jendraschek, G. (2014). "Future tense, prospective aspect, and irrealis mood as part of the situation perspective: Insights from Basque, Turkish, and Papuan". In De Brabanter, P., M. Kissine, and S. Sharifzadeh (Eds.), *Future Times, Future Tenses.* (pp. 138-164). Oxford Academic. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199679157.001.0001.

Kanık, M. (2015). The Turkish Aorist and Progressive: Present Tense, Future Tense, or What? *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *11*(1), 103-115.

Kornfilt, J. (1997). Turkish. Routledge.

Lewis, G. (1967). Turkish grammar. Oxford University Press.

Rivero, M. L. (2009). Intensionality, High Applicatives, and Aspect: Involuntary State Constructions in Bulgarian and Slovenian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 27*, 151-196.

Rullmann, H., Huijsmans, M., Matthewson, L., and Todorović, N. (2022). Why Plain Futurates are Different. *Linguistic Inquiry, 54*(1), 197–208. doi: https://doi.org/10.1162/ling_a_00435.

Vetter, D. C. (1973). Someone Solves This Problem Tomorrow. *Linguistic Inquiry*, *4*(1), 104-08. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177759. Accessed 9 Oct. 2023.

Yavaş, F. (1979). The Turkish Aorist. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics*, *4*(1), 41-49.