The progressive in Europe

1. Progressive: questionnaire and sample

1.1. Method

The progressive aspect is often identified with the imperfective aspect, rather than being treated as an aspect in its own right. When looking at the progressive aspect in the languages of Europe, one is inclined to take English as a starting point because English seems to be the preeminent language illustrating a fully grammatized progressive. On the basis of the use of the progressive in English, one could infer rules and relevant properties for describing "the" progressive in other languages. We decided to do otherwise. On the basis of a typological questionnaire (PROGQ), we established whether a language has a special form (which we call PROG) and whether such a form may be used in a number of specific cases. The informants for the different languages were asked to give the translation of the sentences after considering the contexts and extra information specified between slashes and square brackets. The first sentences were aimed at establishing whether a language has a dedicated PROG form or not. Consider the following sentences:

(1) (PROGQ: 1)
[Somebody on the phone wants to know about Ann; the answer is: -- Ann is next to me]
She WORK [right now].

(2) (PROGQ: 2)
[A: What does Ann do every Saturday morning?]
B: She CLEAN THE HOUSE/READ

The obvious difference between (1) and (2) is that in PROGQ: 1 the event is viewed as still in progress at the relevant moment (in this case, the speech moment), whereas in PROGQ: 2 no single moment is focussed on (the sentence indicates a habitual situation). In order to say that in a language there is a specific PROG form, it should be possible:
(i) either to use a different form in these two sentences, or
(ii) at least to have available in the first sentence an alternative form that is not available in the second.
A straightforward translation of sentences (1–2) into Dutch gives the following picture:

(3) Dutch
   a. (PROGQ: 1)
      Ze zit te werken.
      she sits to work
      ‘She is working.’
   b. (PROGQ: 2)
      Dan maakt ze het huis schoon.
      then makes she the house clean
      ‘She is cleaning the house then.’

A construction as in (3b) can also be used to answer the question implicitly present in (1), whereas a construction as in (3a), based on a postural verb, would not be appropriate as an answer to the question that provides the context in (2). Consider:

(4) Dutch
   a. (PROGQ: 1)
      Ze maakt het huis schoon.
      she makes the house clean
      ‘She is cleaning the house.’
   b. (PROGQ: 2)
      Dan loopt ze het huis schoon te maken.
      then walks she the house clean to make
      ‘She is then cleaning the house.’

On the basis of these observations one could consider Dutch to have a specific PROG form.

Languages may also present special constructions, named “absentive” (ABSV) in De Groot (this volume), which are used to suggest that a given agent is remote from the deictic centre, performing a certain action. There are subtle analogies, as well as differences, between PROG and ABSV (cf. Section 3 below). In order to avoid the use of an ABSV instead of a PROG in the translation of sentences like PROGQ: 1, the context was specified with the locational phrase next to me. This type of locational phrase allows PROG but is incompatible with ABSV.

As is well-known, languages may have a progressive/non-progressive opposition in other tenses than the Present, sometimes to the exclusion of the latter (cf. Section 2.8 below). For that reason, sentences similar to (1–2) were also provided with past time reference:

(5) (PROGQ: 3)
    [Last night at 8 o’clock,] when John came, Ann still WORK.

(6) (PROGQ: 4)
    Last year we [usually] CLEAN THE HOUSE on Saturdays [now we do it on Thursdays].

(7) (PROGQ: 5)
    Last summer, John VISIT us three times.

Sentence PROGQ: 3 could contain PROG, whereas the other two sentences should not. PROGQ: 4 is a habitual sentence, while PROGQ: 5, by virtue of the numerical specification, is only compatible with a perfective viewpoint. As to PROGQ: 3, the following two assumptions were made:
(i) If a language uses a PROG form in the present tense, it also allows the use of this form in the past tense.
(ii) If a language does not use a PROG form in the present, the language may use it in the past tense.

In order to test the usage of the forms elicited, in fact to obtain some indication as to their degree of grammaticalization, a number of sentences were concerned with the possible combination of particular grammatical categories, such as tense, mood, passive, causative etc. Section 2 briefly presents some of these topics. For a detailed report, cf. the chapters by Bertinetto, Ebert and Tommola in Part IV of this volume.

1.2. The sample

The potential sample of languages was the list of 150 languages of Europe, as established in the EUROTYP Guidelines. Since the investigation of the progressive started rather late in our project, it was not possible to get information on as many languages as we hoped. Questionnaires were only returned for the following languages: Albanian, Basque, Catalan, Danish, Dutch, English, Estonian, Fering, Finnish, Frash, Frisian, German, Greek, Hungarian, Icelandic, Irish, Italian, Kalmyk, Karachi, Maltese, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Rusyn, Serbo-Croatian, Spanish, Turkish, Swedish, and Zürriütitsch.

1.3. The data

For some languages, there was more than one informant. The answers of the different informants for one language sometimes showed considerable variation. This is due to the fact that most of the languages do not have a grammaticalized PROG. The
variation consists in the use of the Simple (imperfective) tenses in contrast to specific PROG forms on the one hand, and in the use of different PROG candidates on the other. Obviously, it would always be preferable to have a rather large number of informants for each language.

The PROGQ consists of two parts (cf. Appendix). Part I contains 83 sentences to be translated. Part II, which is meant for linguists with a good knowledge of the language investigated, contains several questions related to grammar.

2. The morphosyntactic expression of PROG

2.1. Introduction

Progressivity may be specified in several ways. See table 1 for a synoptic view of the morphosyntactic devices used in four major language families of Europe. Note that in this chapter we shall only consider morphosyntactic tools that are specialized for progressivity, or that have it as their main reading. We shall therefore leave out the progressive uses of simple tenses, although these are in some cases (e.g., in the Baltic-Finnic domain) the devices most frequently employed to convey the idea of progressivity. One further possibility could consist in a specification outside the verb by means of an adverbial (such as at this moment). However, we did not take this kind of device into consideration, for it is quite unspecific. We only focussed on expressions related to the verb or the verb phrase. Thus, whenever we use the abbreviation PROG, this must be intended as referring to a specialized morphosyntactic device, rather than to the broad semantic notion of progressivity.

In his typological study of the progressive, Blansitt (1975) proposed the following morphosyntactic classification:

a. Affixal progressive markers
b. Complex verb phrases as progressive signals
   i. verb phrases with a copula as auxiliary
   ii. verb phrases with a motion or postural verb as auxiliary
   iii. verb phrases with a pro-predicate (do-type) as auxiliary
   iv. verb phrases with a special progressive auxiliary verb

If we apply this classification to our material, the languages of Europe mainly exhibit examples of complex verb phrases, the types (i), (ii) and (iv). In this section we will shortly discuss the morphosyntactic situation. A more detailed discussion of the data is given in the following chapters, dealing with subsets of the languages of Europe (Germanic, Romance, Baltic Finnic), as well as in the chapter on Maltese by Ebert.

2.2. Affixal progressive

Turkish is the only language of Europe which expresses PROG by means of an affix, the suffix -yor, as in:

(8) Turkish
    Çalış-yor-du
    work-YOR:PST
    ‘He was working.’

Some varieties of Arabic could be considered to have a prefixal progressive marker. Maltese, the only variety which falls inside the domain of the languages of Europe, uses an analytical form (cf. Ebert, this volume b).

2.3. Verb phrases with a copula as auxiliary

One type of expression using a copula is the one where a copula combines with a Gerund. Examples of this type are Catalan, English, Italian, Brazilian Portuguese, Spanish, Kalmyk and Karachai.

(9) a. English
    Peter is writing a letter.
    b. Spanish
    Estaba hablando con una chica.
    was:1SG talk:GER with a girl
    ‘I was talking with a girl.’
    c. Italian
    Lei sta lavorando.
    she is work:GER
    ‘She is working.’

We consider It. stare in expressions such as (9c) to be a copula, although this verb can be used as an independent lexical verb with the meaning of 'stand, be (in a certain location)'. In fact, in examples such as (9c) stare seems to have lost its lexical meaning. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that, except for some Central and Southern varieties of spoken Italian, this verb has not reached the full copula function typical of Spanish estar, which can also be used with adjectival predicates.

A second type combines a copula with an Infinitive or a related form, differently denominated in the various grammatical traditions (such as Supine or the like). Languages using this type of expression are Estonian, Finnish, Karelian, Sami, Livonian, and Vepsian. As can be seen from the list of languages, this type is limited to Finnic
2.4. Verb phrases with a motion or postural verb as auxiliary

Expressions with a motion verb (‘come’ and ‘go’) as an auxiliary may sometimes be associated with progressive meaning. Note, however, that in a number of cases this type of construction indicates other meanings, such as ingressivity or near future (e.g. Dutch), future (French, Portuguese, Spanish), or past (Catalan). And even when it constitutes a true PROG device, it is often not interchangeable in the same contexts with the copular constructions. As a matter of fact, these constructions take on the “durative” rather than the “focalized” meaning of the progressive (cf. Section 3 for further qualifications). Examples of this are to be found in the Romance languages: Catalan, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish (as well as French, where it is, however, quite rare).

(13) a. Spanish
   El calor venía durando demasiado
   ‘The heat had been lasting too long.’

b. Italian (Sardinian variety) (PROGQ: 52)
   Va dimenticando.
   ‘He is forgetting.’

c. Dutch
   Wie is aan het zwemmen.
   ‘He is swimming.’

Another type of motion verb (‘walk’, ‘go around’) is used in some Germanic languages (Danish, Dutch, and all varieties of Frisian). Consider:

(14) Dutch
   Marie loopt bloemen uit te venten
   ‘Mary walks flowers out to hawk.’

This type of expression is sometimes indistinguishable from the postural verb construction (cf. section 5 and Ebert, this volume a, section 2.5). The majority of the Germanic languages allow postural verbs as an auxiliary. Danish, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish coordinate the postural verb with the finite form of the main verb. Consider:

(15) Swedish
    Han sitter och läser tidningen.
    ‘He is sitting and reading newspaper-the’

Dutch and all varieties of Frisian use a postural verb + infinitival marker + Infinitive:
2.5. Verb phrases with a special progressive auxiliary verb

There are very few languages which use a dedicated verb as an auxiliary. Swedish and Yiddish are two examples. They express PROG with the help of a verb meaning 'hold':

(17) Swedish
    En ny kyrka håller på att byggas.
    a new church keeps on to build:PASS
    'A new church is being built.'

2.6. Other types

We have found other types of expressions which can be associated with progressive meaning. The first type is based on the use of a particle. A clear example of a language using a particle is Albanian. One way of expressing PROG in Albanian consists of the use of the emphatic particle po.\(^4\) Compare:

(18) Albanian
    a. Laj.
        wash:1SG
        'I wash.'
    b. Po laj.
        PTCL wash:1SG
        'I am washing.'

We also consider Basque to use a particle, of the form ari. This particle, however, is originally the Infinitive form of a verb meaning 'keep doing something'. The use of this form requires the auxiliary izan which agrees with the subject, as well as the Imperfective Participle. For that reason, the auxiliary together with the form ari could also be considered a compound verb (cf. King 1994: 383).\(^5\)

(19) Basque
    Zer idazten ari zara?
    what write:IPFV PTCL be:2SG
    'What are you writing?'

The other device we found is a syntactic device. In Finnish and Hungarian word order plays a role in the interpretation of PROG. In Finnish the use of the copula together with the "third Infinitive" with the inessive case ending usually expresses PROG. The same construction may also express the ABSV. When an object is present, the two readings can be disambiguated by means of word order. Compare:

(20) Finnish
        I am sell:3INF:INESS tickets:PRTV
        'I am selling tickets.' (progressive)
    b. Minä olen lippuja myy-mää-ssää.
        I am tickets:PRTV sell:3INF:INESS
        'I am off selling tickets.' (absentive)

Hungarian lacks any morphological marking for progressive. However, word order together with a specific intonation contour of the clause allows for a progressive interpretation (cf. Hetzron 1982, Kiefer 1994). Compare the following two examples, where ‹ ' ′ indicates focal stress and ‹ ' ′ neutral stress:

(21) Hungarian
    a. Mari le-vitte a bort, amikor csendetnek.
        Mary down-carried the wine when ring:3SG
        'Mary carried down the wine when the doorbell rang.'
    b. Mari 'vitte le a bort, amikor csendetnek.
        Mary carried down the wine when ring:3SG
        'Mary was carrying down the wine when the doorbell rang.'

2.7. Progressive and other "aspectual" distinctions

PROG does not seem to be compatible with the so-called Perfective aspect, as present in the Slavic languages or Hungarian.\(^6\) In the sentences of the PROGQ where some form of PROG could be used, the Slavic languages tend to use the Imperfective (cf. fn. 36 in Bertinetto & Delfitto, this volume, for some detail). Hungarian might be considered an exception. In fact, the construction illustrated in (21b), allowing for the progressive interpretation, is based on the Perfective verb form, but the sentence does not express perfective aspect. The point is that this example lacks an element with focal stress to the left of the verb, which is a requirement for the perfective aspect to apply in Hungarian (the word order in (21a), on the other hand, necessarily involves a focalized element). Note, however, that Hungarian could hardly be considered to be a language with a genuine PROG construction.
The case of the Ibero-Romance languages is clearly different. The auxiliary 
existir has an imperfective and a perfective conjugation: both the imperfective and the
perfective Past can be used with PROG (cf. Bertinetto, this volume; Olbertz 1998).
Consider for instance:

(22) Spanish
Estuve deambulando por las calles.
was:SPSG stroll:GER about the streets
'I was strolling about the streets (i.e., for some time).'

However, these are aspecral distinctions of a different sort, which have little to do
with the distinctions to be observed in Hungarian or in Slavic languages (cf. again
fn. 5). Viewed from this perspective, example (22) does not represent an exception
to the generalization above. Note further that Perfect tenses (generally expressed
in European languages by the compound tenses), which constitute a particular sub-
domain of the perfective domain, may be associated with PROG devices in quite a
number of languages (cf. below Sections 3 and 4, and Bertinetto, this volume, Ebert,
this volume a, Tommola, this volume).

Summing up, the progressive aspect is in principle compatible with both perfective
and imperfective tenses, although it occurs most often with the imperfective ones. As
to the languages presenting the distinction Perfective/Imperfective, PROG clearly
favours the Imperfective predicates.

2.8. Progressive and tense distinctions

Our material supports the assumption made by Blansitt (1975: 30) that there are
never more tense distinctions in progressive than in non-progressive. On a broad
typological scale, several languages allow a progressive/non-progressive opposition in
the past tenses, but not in the present. For instance, the Hungarian construction
presented in (21b) can only be found in the past. Another example comes from
Lithuanian. While the Simple Present is ambiguously progressive/non-progressive,
among the past and future tenses the simple forms of the copula būti combines with
the Present Active Participle to form PROG (cf. Blansitt 1975: 20).

3. Typological observations

3.1. Individuating the main types

The research conducted within EUROTYPE made it possible to delineate, with a good
amount of detail, a comprehensive picture of the typology of progressive construc-
tions in European languages. However, since most of our data concern Western

Europe, in this section we are going to restrict our observations to the Baltic Finnic,
Germanic and Romance languages, where (as shown in Thieroff, this volume) the
presence of specialized PROG devices is particularly well attested (but cf. Section 5
for a glance at Eastern Europe). Recall that, as stated in Section 2.1 above, the abbre-
viation PROG must be intended as referring to specialized morphosyntactic devices,
rather than to the semantic notion of progressivity, for which the single languages
may have at their disposal other grammatical tools.

The different status of PROG in the various languages has obvious typological
consequences. In languages like English, Irish, Icelandic or Maltese, it is quite likely
that the respective PROG devices have reached a status of complete grammatical-
ization, considering that these are the only tools available to express the notion of
progressivity. In other languages, however, the situation looks more complex. On
the one hand, PROG constructions are not without competitors in that specific func-
tion, and not only in relation to simple imperfective tenses, but also with respect to
the existence of more than one PROG device in one and the same language. On the
other hand, these constructions may appear altogether to have a fairly low frequency
in spontaneous linguistic usage. And here again the situation may vary. In Baltic
Finnic, PROG seems to be used more in formal than in informal styles, whereas in
the Romance and most of the Germanic area the reverse is true (at least as far as the
most standard devices are considered).

Table 1 is a synoptic presentation of the main morphological types to be found
in the three groups considered here (cf. Bertinetto, this volume, Ebert, this volume
a, and Tommola, this volume, for further qualifications concerning these data). De-
spite the multiplicity of meanings conveyed by these constructions in the various
languages, three main types (or functions) may be isolated:

(i.) “Focalized” progressive constructions (henceforth Foc-PROG), i.e. those
expressing the notion of an event viewed as going on at a single point in time, here
called “focalization point”. The focalization point may be overtly expressed in the
sentence, or else it may be recovered through the context, being the object of a pre-
supposition. Needless to say, the focalization point does not exhaustively localize
the event; it simply indicates a point in time overlapping the progressive event, while
the actual duration of the latter remains indeterminate.

(ii.) “Durative” progressive constructions (henceforth Dur-PROG), i.e. those that
are evaluated relative to a larger interval of time. Here again, however, the actual
duration of the event remains indeterminate. Even when a durative temporal adver-
bial is present, this does not delimit the event but merely yields a vantage point from
which the situation is observed.

(iii.) “Absentive” constructions (ABSV), i.e., those conveying the meaning of an
event occurring in a place (characteristically reserved for a given purpose) displaced
from the deictic centre.
### D. ALTAIC languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sim. convert type</th>
<th>participial type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-f-baä-tyov;</td>
<td>-fa- -a (+baä-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONV-SIM + ‘be’/’move’</td>
<td>PCPL-IPFV (+ ‘be’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar -a tür-</td>
<td>CONV-SIM + ‘be, stand’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: The same constructions as in Karachay and Tatar exist in most other Turkic languages, though functions vary somewhat from language to language.

The distinction between Foc-PROG and Dur-PROG is illustrated in particular in Bertinneto, this volume, with reference to Romance languages (cf. also Johanson, this volume, for the notion of focality), but it was already implicitly hinted at by Blansitt (1975). As to the notion ABSV, cf. De Groot, this volume. Suffice it to say that ABSV constructions exist in no fewer than eight European languages. Actually, in most cases ABSV devices differ morphologically from specifically PROG ones. However, in at least two languages (Finnish and Faroese) the two constructions coincide. It is therefore legitimate to examine this type in conjunction with PROG. In the final part of Section 4 we shall tackle the question of the proper relation between PROG and ABSV.

To illustrate the issue, consider the following Finnish sentences, exemplifying the three main types, in the order given above (for Faroese, cf. Ebert, this volume a, ex. 43):

(23) Finnish

a. Foc-PROG

Kun lamppu putosi pöydälle, Hannu oli syömässä
when lamp fell table:ALL Hannu was eat ASN
puuroa-nsa.
porridge:PTTV-POSS:3SG
‘When the lamp fell on the table, Hannu was eating his porridge.’

b. Dur-PROG

Viime tiistaina Nina oli pitämissä esitelmän Helsinki:NESS
last tuesday Nina was keep:NESS talk Helsinki:NESS
‘Last Tuesday, Nina gave a talk in Helsinki.’

### B. ROMANCE languages, plus English (from Bertinneto, this volume, with modifications)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>copular AUX type</th>
<th>motion AUX type</th>
<th>Marginal types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan: estar + GER</td>
<td>anar + GER</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French: -</td>
<td>aller + GER</td>
<td>être en train de + INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian: stare + GER</td>
<td>andare/venire + GER</td>
<td>essere dietro a + INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese: estar a + INF</td>
<td>vir + GER</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a fi în curs de + INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish: estar + GER</td>
<td>irlandar/venir + GER?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English: be + V-ing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. BALTIC FINNIC languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estonian</th>
<th>olem + V-ma +s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be + SUPINE + INESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>olla + V-ma +sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be + 3rd-INF + INESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: The same construction also exists in Karelian, Livonian, Vepsian (Eastern Baltic Finnic languages) and in Sami.
c. ABSV
   Jouko oli lippuja myymässä.
   Jouko was selling tickets.

Finnish is a somewhat exceptional language, for (as noted above) the same construction can be used in all three meanings. It is interesting, however, that this case exists because, as we shall see, there are a number of analogies between ABSV and PROG. Although we would not wish to claim that they are, in a broad perspective, typologically related, it is probably justified to put them side by side at least for comparative purposes. Indeed, it is often the case that both PROG and ABSV may occur in the same context, as in the following examples:

(24) Italian
   a. PROG
      Aldo non è qui. Si sta allenando.
      Aldo is not here. He is training.
   b. ABSV
      Aldo non è qui. E’ ad allenarsi.
      Aldo is not here. He is training.

although, strictly speaking, they ultimately answer different questions (“What is X doing?” vs. “Where is X?”).

By contrast, the opposition Foc-PROG vs. Dur-PROG does not always correspond to a morphological difference. The same constructions may often express both meanings. However, this is not the case with all PROG devices. For instance, the standard PROG constructions to be found in Standard Italian and French seem by and large restricted to the focalized interpretation. Conversely, some of the constructions to be found in certain Germanic languages (namely, those based on postural verbs) are most naturally interpreted in the durative meaning; and this is also true, in fact, of the Italian PROG variant built with the Infinitive instead of the Gerund (cf. Table 1).

There is some evidence suggesting that the first examples of PROG constructions, in languages for which we have old testimonies, could be used in contexts which exclude a purely focalized reading. Consider the following texts, quoted from Dietrich (1973) and Bybee et al. (1994) respectively:

(25) a. Latin (Vulgata, John 10.40)
      [..] ubi erat Johannis prius baptizans [..]
      where was John before baptizing
      ‘[..] where John had previously been baptizing people [..]’

b. Old English (Ælfric, Lives, I, 11.52–55)
   Sume syndan creopendes on corða mid eallum lichoman, swa
   some are creeping on earth with whole body, as
   swa wurmas doð. Same gað on twam foton, sume on
   some on two feet, some on
   as worms do. Some go on four feet, some on
   feower foton, sume fleod mid fyðerum.
   four feet, some fly with feathers
   ‘Some (animals) creep on the earth with their body, just as worms do. Some walk on two feet, some on four, some fly with their wings.’

Of special interest is example (25b), for the PROG construction used there makes up (in Carlsson’s 1978 terms) an “individual-level” predicate, i.e., a predicate exhibiting a “permanent” stative meaning, namely: ‘some animals have the permanent property of creeping on the ground’. This suggests that even though these old constructions could appear in contexts, such as (26), which are compatible with a focalized reading, their overall semantic interpretation must have been different from the one that is available to their modern equivalents (note, however, that the focalized interpretation of (26), although very likely, is not necessarily the meaning intended by the writer):

(26) Latin (Vetus Latina, Coloss., 1.6)
   ... et est fructificans et crescent sicut in vobis ex qua
   and is fruitifying and growing as in you since that
   die audistis et cognovistis gratiam dei in
   die hear:2PL:PST and learn:2PL:PST grace god:GEN in
   veritate.”
   truth
   ‘... and it is giving fruit and growing in you since the day when you heard
   it and became acquainted with God’s grace.’

Nevertheless, the existence of potentially focalized contexts indicates an easy line of development, which was taken by virtually all PROG devices, sometimes up to the extreme consequence of specializing as a purely focalized periphrasis, as in the case of the Italian Gerund PROG. By this, we do not want to suggest that the evolution undergone by the latter device shows the ultimate stage to be reached by these constructions. As is well known, there may be further stages (possibly reached at the end of an alternative developmental path), like the stage consisting of the complete reinterpretation of PROG as a general-purpose imperfective tool. See the following section for further comments on this.
3.2. Semantic and morphosyntactic classification

Let us now have a close look at the data, with the aim of finding the analogies and the differences that concern the three main types listed above as (i–iii). Table 2 is an attempt at listing the behaviour of these three types with respect to a number of relevant features. It should be borne in mind that the labels “Foc-PROG” and “Dur-PROG” stand for broad semantic categories, rather than for independent morphosyntactic constructions. Indeed, as we are going to show in Section 4, one and the same PROG construction may often correspond to more than one semantic category. As to the correspondence between these broad semantic categories and the concrete manifestations of PROG, further qualifications will be provided in Section 4. The rest of this section will be a commentary on Table 2.

The first cell of Table 2 relates to the locative content of the three types considered. As is well known, PROG constructions include, in one way or another, a locative morpheme. This may consist for instance of an auxiliary verb indicating existence or position (as in virtually every European PROG device), of an explicit marker of locativity (like the inessive case in Finnish PROG), or of a combination of more than one such morphemes (as again in Finnish PROG, which combines both of the above features). However, although the morphological structure of these constructions is based on a locative morpheme of some kind, the degree to which this meaning component persists in each construction varies from case to case. It is obviously prominent in ABSV devices, with the addition of an implication of remoteness/invisibility of the agent. This is indeed the distinctive feature of this construction. As to Foc-PROG, it should be observed that no residue of the original locative meaning persists in this type, as is proven by the possibility of using motion verbs, like in: *Fred is going home*. Note that motion verbs are admitted with the ABSV only when they indicate the specific activity that the agent is performing in the particular location in which s/he finds him/herself. For instance, German *Hans ist laufen* ‘Hans is (away and is) engaged in the activity of running’ could be said of somebody who regularly visits the running track and is currently away for that purpose. By contrast, verbs of directed motion, designating the locomotion towards the remote site, cannot appear with the ABSV. This restriction is absent with Foc-PROG, and this distinguishes it not only from the ABSV but, above all, from Dur-PROG, which is hardly compatible with all sorts of motion verbs. This is notably the case with Germanic PROG constructions based on postural auxiliaries, which preserve to some extent their etymological meaning (Ebert this volume a, Section 3.1.1). But even with Germanic constructions of the prepositional type (cf. Table 1), the availability of motion verbs is, generally speaking, quite weak (Ebert this volume a, Section 3.1.1). As to Finnish PROG, which has only recently been grammaticalized in the focalized meaning, it rejects directed movement verbs altogether, and employs instead nominal constructions (Tommola, this volume).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOC-PROG</th>
<th>DUR-PROG</th>
<th>ABSENTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Persistence of locative meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with directed motion verbs</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remoteness / invisibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Focalization point reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with non-durative verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Temporariness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of determinate duration adverbials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatically defined duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Compatibility with perfective tenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible inclusive value of ‘perfect’ tenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Compatibility with the habitual reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of interpretative meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Agentivity requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with negation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with stative verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Compatibility with the Imperative</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with the passive</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible occurrence with the Infinitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic modals’ government</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cell B of Table 2 refers to the features that specifically make up the focalized meaning (cf. point (i) of section 3.1 for an illustration of this notion). As shown in (23a) above, this reading presupposes that the focalization point be "familiar" to the speaker and the addressee. This may be obtained by means of a punctual temporal adverb (such as at 2 o'clock), or by a temporal clause of the appropriate kind which instantiates the so-called "incidental schema"9, as in the example cited. This is a crucial property, for it shows that Foc-PROG has a purely imperfective aspectual value. Indeed, Foc-PROG is only compatible with imperfective tenses, such as the Imperfect in languages which exhibit an overt aspectual opposition among the past tenses. Dur-PROG and ACSV, by contrast, may easily be employed with perfective tenses, such as the Simple or Compound Past in Romance languages (cf. below for further comments on this). The impossibility of using perfective tenses with the Italian, French or Albanian PROG (the latter, more specifically, in the variant based on the particle po) is a decisive argument for ascribing these tools to the focalized type. It should be noted, in this connection, that the type of syntactic frame to which the incidental schema belongs enables a focalized reading even in languages where PROG is but weakly grammaticalized, like the Baltic Finnic languages (Metelang 1995, Heinämaa 1995, Tommola, this volume) or those, among the Germanic languages, that are less advanced in the grammaticalization process. Another typical textual situation which forces the focalized reading is "reportive" discourse, i.e., the kind of description that radio and television commentators make about live events. In such cases, the focalization point coincides (either explicitly or implicitly) with the speech time.

Unsurprisingly, only Foc-PROG is compatible with non-durative verbs, which are instead ruled out in durative contexts such as those implied by Dur-PROG. In particular, achievement verbs (which constitute the bulk of non-durative predicates) may develop an "imminent" reading with Foc-PROG, suggesting that the event will soon occur although it is not yet occurring at the focalization point. Consider well-known examples such as: The grandfather was dying, or The train is leaving. A special class of achievements is constituted by "phasal" verbs such as begin, finish and the like, which again allow only for Foc-PROG (cf. PROGQ: 23–25). Interestingly, with achievement verbs Italian often tends to use an explicit PROG construction, although the Simple (imperfective) tenses may usually express the progressive reading by themselves (Delitto & Bertinetto 1995). Apparently, in these cases the speaker needs to emphasize that the intended interpretation of the sentence is indeed progressive, despite the non-durative character of the verb. Conversely, not all Germanic languages may freely employ PROG in such contexts, and this is notably the case with the variant based on postural verbs (cf. Table 1). As to the ACSV, non-durative verbs may be employed, although they do not constitute the most common choice. An ACSV situation typically includes "adjacent" actions, besides the one specifically referred to. The structure of the event is in fact as follows: "go to remote location--perform the action--return to source location". Thus, even a momentary verb like cut the ribbon may be used (cf. Italian Il sindaco è a tagliare il nastro 'The Mayor is off cutting the ribbon').

Cell C concerns the duration of the event. Several authors have claimed temporariness to be a relevant feature of the progressive. Indeed, it is even the case that in English some stative verbs (mainly of the postural/locational type) may be used with PROG precisely when the notion of temporariness is involved. Consider cases such as:

(27) (PROGQ: 59)
The statue is standing in the garden. [i.e., for a limited period]

Note, however, that this restriction does not concern Foc-PROG, which can also be used in cases such as PROGQ: 60: The earth is turning around the sun, despite the permanent nature of the condition referred to. As to ACSV, temporariness is, of course, one of its defining features, as shown by De Groot, this volume. As a matter of fact, the ACSV implies the idea of a conventionally defined duration, tied to the expected time-window involved in performing the event. As to compatibility with the adverbials indicating "determinate duration", this is excluded with Foc-PROG for obvious reasons, but admitted by Dur-PROG, although the situation varies from language to language, and from adverbial to adverbial. It is a fact, however, that Dur-PROG may admit adverbials such as “from t₁ to t₂”, “for X Time”, “until t”, “for the whole duration of ...”, and the like. For some Germanic languages this is actually the preferred context for the use of the construals based on postural verbs (Ebert, this volume, Section 3.2); and this is equally true for the Romance constructions based on motion verbs when perfective tenses are employed (Bertinetto, this volume). As to ACSV, however, the presence of "determinate duration" adverbials seems to be generally (but not necessarily) avoided. Apparently, since the duration of the event is pragmatically defined and easily recoverable, these phrases tend to leave in the background the explicit indication of the time boundaries.

Cell D is, from the point of view of the aspectual characterization, somehow symmetric to cell B. Just as a strictly imperfective interpretation is required for Foc-PROG, Dur-PROG and ACSV are easily accessible to perfective tenses.10 Consider a sentence such as:

(28) Spanish
estuvo leyendo todo el día.
was:SP:3SG read:GER all the day
'S/he spent the whole day reading.'
A special case, among perfective tenses, is represented by those that express the aspectual value of “perfect”, which in European languages often assume the form of compound tenses. When this aspectual value is instantiated, Dur-PROG may convey (with activity verbs) an “inclusive” meaning, suggesting that the event has been going on up to the reference time, and may possibly continue beyond that point (as in: *I have been reading the whole day, i.e., until the present moment*). Significantly, although the Standard Italian Foc-PROG, based on the auxiliary verb *stare*, cannot be used with compound tenses, the corresponding Dur-PROG constructions (those based on a motion verb followed by Gerund, or on *stare a* followed by the Infinitive) can.

Cell E deals once more with the possible aspectual interpretation of the three types of constructions under discussion. Foc-PROG is generally unavailable to the habitual reading; it may tolerate it only in correlative structures of the type: *whenever PERFECTIVE NON-DURATIVE, then PROGRESSIVE*. This is no wonder, for these syntactic frames, besides making explicit the habitual meaning of the sentence, enable us to isolate a series of punctual temporal locations, each of which can work as a focalization point for the progressive event. By contrast, Dur-PROG and ABSV are often available to a habitual interpretation, even without the facilitation of an appropriate syntactic structure. The licensing contexts seem to be the same in both cases. Consider, as an illustration, examples (28–29) in Bertinetto, this volume, from which it also emerges that not all languages have equally easy access to habitual contexts. Somehow related to habituality, although distinct from it, is the so-called “interpretative” use of PROG (König & Lutzzeiser 1973; König 1995; cf. also Bertinetto this volume, Section 6.3.2). Although this use is quite marginal in most languages, it is fairly frequent, for instance, in English. Here is an example:

(29) If we selected the best described languages, we *would also be selecting* the languages with the largest number of speakers.

The reason for the analogy with habituality is that this use may be fostered by correlative frames such as: *by doing X, you are (implicitly) doing Y*, which are somewhat reminiscent of the correlative habitual frames cited above. However, since in interpretative contexts the first clause does not contain a non-durative perfective event, it cannot provide any sort of focalization point. Hence, the interpretative use is only possible with a durative reading.

Cell F focuses on agentivity. In the languages where PROG may readily be used with a focalized meaning, this requirement plays no role. Consider:

(30) When I came, the sun was shining gloriously.

Although this particular sentence may require an appropriate contextualization, it is perfectly acceptable in the relevant situations. By contrast, both ABSV and Dur-PROG are likely to be sensitive to agentivity, at least to some extent, although (as far as the latter is concerned) the strength of this restriction varies from case to case. It is specially strong in Baltic Finnic languages (Heinämäki 1995), whereas Germanic languages show a differentiated behaviour. Obviously, negation is inversely correlated with the notion of agentivity. Thus, it is no wonder that in Baltic Finnic languages and in most Germanic ones, i.e. in the languages where PROG fairly often exhibits a durative interpretation, there are restrictions on the usage of negation in progressive contexts. As to ABSV, the restriction concerning negation is fairly strong for pragmatic reasons but is not absolute. For instance, negation may present a contrastive value (cf. German *Rolf ist nicht laufen, er ist einkaufen* ‘Rolf is away, his purpose being running rather than shopping’).

As to stative verbs, they should be ruled out altogether. Indeed, this is often regarded as one of the most important defining features of progressivity. However, it turns out that stative verbs may sometimes combine with PROG, although the situation varies from language to language (Bertinetto 1994). But note that things differ for Foc-PROG and Dur-PROG. With the former, the stative verbs that appear in progressive sentences normally take on a non-stative meaning, with the marginal exception of some postural and locational English verbs (such as the verb *stand* discussed in (27) above), which preserve their stative character. Consider, for example, the copular predicates of PROGQ: 42–43, where the use of PROG (available to most Ibero-Romance languages as well as English) forces the activity interpretation in these intrinsically ambiguous predicates. To illustrate, *John is being clever* hints at John’s temporary behaviour, rather than to a permanent characterization of his. Consequently, these are not true counterexamples to the regularity stated above. By contrast, Dur-PROG does not necessarily exclude stative verbs. This is shown in particular by languages where the relevant construction is at a very early stage of grammaticalization, such as Estonian (Metslän 1995; Tommola, this volume). And this, as observed above in relation to example (25), seems to be a prominent fact in the diachronic evolution of PROG.

Finally, cell G reports data concerning the compatibility of PROG and ABSV constructions with some relevant morphological categories. To start with, consider their compatibility with the Imperative, which is often quite weak. The languages which allow this use tend to be those that present a fully grammaticalized PROG device, like English and Catalan, although this feature may surprisingly appear even in Romanian, a language virtually without PROG (Bertinetto, this volume). Our data suggest that the Imperative is most probable in durative contexts, although it may also appear in focalized ones, such as PROGQ: 73 (*Be working when the boss returns!*). On the other hand, the Imperative is definitely ruled out with the ABSV. Compatibility with the passive is also a clue to an advanced stage of grammaticalization. Apparently,
this possibility is again excluded with the ABSV.\(^{13}\) Essentially the same applies to the use of the Infinitive with PROG. To be exact, we refer here to contexts where PROG takes the Infinitive as a consequence of being syntactically governed by a predicate governing this mood.\(^{14}\) Note that compatibility with the Infinitive seems to arise before compatibility with the Imperative and the passive. For example, the Infinitive is at least marginally possible in Italian, where the passive and the Imperative are not at all available. Once more it should be noted that this morphological feature is mostly to be expected in durative contexts. One peculiar case of Infinitive PROG is constituted by sentences where this construction is governed by modal verbs, as in PROGQ: 79–80. The interesting fact here is that only Dur-PROG admits the deontic interpretation, although these cases seem to exist only in informal registers. Normally, the only reading available with Foc-PROG is the epistemic one, as in: Anne must be feeding the animals, I guess (Bertinetto, this volume, Section 3.1).

4. A diachronic sketch

4.1. Stages of development

Let us now consider the diachronic issue. We shall first examine the problem of Foc-PROG and Dur-PROG, delaying the question of the ABSV (namely of its relationship to PROG constructions) until the end of this section.

As to Foc-PROG and Dur-PROG, one could in principle defend the proposal that both types of periphrases can constitute the original nucleus, depending on the language. However, there is some evidence that Dur-PROG represents the original stage. Consider first the case of Italian. We know for sure that this language underwent a dramatic diachronic development. The PROG construction based on the auxiliary stare is now used exclusively (or almost exclusively) in foci-ized contexts, but in the early stages it could also be used in durative contexts (Bertinetto, this volume, Section 2). This invites the conclusion that Dur-PROG instantiates the original meaning of this construction, and this seems to be true in other cases. The PROG constructions of Ibero-Romance languages and English may cover both the foci-ized and the durative meaning, but we have good evidence that the forerunners of these periphrases, in Latin and Old English, were readily available in contexts which presented a purely durative, or even stative character (as shown by examples (25) above). It is thus reasonable to suppose that the use in focalized contexts was the result of an expansion of the original durative interpretation. As to Germanic languages other than English, one can say with good approximation that the PROG constructions based on postural verbs seem to be especially appropriate for durative contexts; and even the prepositional constructions, which are more flexible in use, often undergo restrictions in focalized contexts (Ebert, this volume a). Putting this together, it appears that in all these cases the original meaning of PROG constructions seems to have been the durative one.

This is not true in every case, though. Among the European languages for which we have reliable data, the only ones, besides Italian, that present a PROG construction exclusively restricted to the foci-ized meaning are French and Albanian. Now, the French periphrasis "être en train de + INF" started out as an intentional construction, and only towards the beginning of the 19th century was it eventually specialized in its current meaning (Gougenheim 1929). There is no evidence that this periphrasis, in its progressive interpretation, ever played the role of a durative device. The same applies to the Albanian construction based on the particle po, whose meaning is close to German gerade.\(^{15}\) However, it seems rather implausible that the French and Albanian constructions, due to their inherent constitution, will ever expand their use to typically durative contexts. Therefore, the exceptions provided by these two languages only prove that some PROG constructions can directly appear as foci-ized devices. Until we find clear evidence of a Dur-PROG construction that started out as a purely Foc-PROG device, we are justified in assuming that the diachronic development, when there is one, goes in the direction indicated above.

This invites the hypothesis that, putting aside the exceptions represented by French and Albanian, the original meaning of most PROG devices must have been that of a stative construction, expressing the idea of “being (i.e., finding oneself/itself) in a state”, as is especially clear with the forerunners of Romance and English PROG constructions, as noted above in relation to examples (25). The purely dynamic (or processual) meaning, which is particularly salient in the foci-ized type, is in most cases a later development, attained at the end of a rather lengthy grammaticalization process. In other words, it appears that most PROG constructions started out as “actional” periphrases, rather than truly “aspectual” ones. The complete attainment of the latter status corresponds to the stage of full grammaticalization.

We may thus hypothesize that, as far as their meaning is concerned, the most typical PROG constructions possibly underwent the stages of development shown in Table 3. Since the historical data are not equally clear for all the languages belonging to the three groups considered in the preceding section (Romance, Germanic and Baltic Finnic), the observations that follow will deal mostly with Romance, with just a few hints to the other groups. The relevant data derive from Bertinetto, this volume.

Stage (i) is linked to the inherent meaning of the morphemes employed. At this stage, the non-finite form of the verb accompanying the locative or postural or motion verb presents a purely "con-verbal" meaning.\(^{16}\) Stage (ii) corresponds to the initial stage of grammaticalization, in which the locative (or postural or motion) verb begins to turn into an auxiliary, while the non-finite form (or the verbal noun) is gradually promoted to the status of head of the construction. At this stage, the semantic bleaching of the auxiliary may begin, although this process is completed only at stage (iii).\(^{17}\) Stage (iv) shows a further development: the context must provide the
Table 3. Diachronic development of progressive constructions in Romance (from actionality to aspect)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i) pure locativity</th>
<th>= stative, durative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ex.: the meaning to be observed in some Latin examples)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) progressivity I</td>
<td>= residually locative, durative, accessible to perfective aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ex.: PROG periphrases based on the verb ‘come’, which preserve some kind of deictic orientation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) progressivity II</td>
<td>= durative, accessible to perfective aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ex.: PROG periphrases based on the verb ‘go’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) progressivity III</td>
<td>= focalized, strictly imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ex.: Modern Italian “stare + Gerund”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) pure imperfectivity</td>
<td>= loss of the progressive character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ex.: possibly to be observed on some non-standard varieties of Latin American Spanish)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

explicit (or presupposed) indication of a single focalization point, which gives PROG its prototypical character. At this stage, the availability of perfective tenses is totally lost: the transformation from an actional to an aspeutual device is completed. Interestingly, French PROG (whose origin is quite different from that of most PROG constructions) entered directly at this level, bypassing all previous stages. Finally, stage (v) is a possible future development, not yet attained by any Romance language.

This step, which has been taken by many European and non-European languages, consists in the eventual reduction of PROG constructions to a purely imperfective form; i.e., a form not restricted to progressive contexts, but appearing also in habitual ones, thus behaving like a typically general-purpose imperfective tense such as the Romance Imperfect. To the European examples quoted by Johanson, this volume (section 7.8), one may at least add Igbo and Yoruba (Comrie 1976: 99–101), as well as Punjabi and Urdu (Dahl 1985). Obviously, at this final stage the restriction concerning stative verbs (cf. cell G of Table 2) is dropped altogether.

The diachronic reconstruction sketched in Table 3 is not intended to suggest that each PROG device to be found in a given language should correspond, at any given moment, to a single and definite stage. This may be true in particular cases, some of which have been mentioned above (recall e.g., French), but it is easy to point out PROG constructions whose usage covers more than one stage of Table 3. Consider for instance English PROG, or the PROG periphrases based on copular verbs in Ibero-Romance languages, or the prepositional type available in a number of Germanic languages (cf. Table 1). Although the degree of grammaticalization varies (being highest in English and Ibero-Romance languages), all these constructions embrace stages (iii) and (iv) at the same time, i.e. they have steadily reached the focalized stage, without losing ground as durative devices. This may be seen, for instance, in the following English sentence, which may be read in the durative meaning:

(31) [A scout, pointing to a series of paw prints, says:] A grizzly was walking here!

The reading that is relevant to our present purpose is the one whereby the scout intends to convey the idea that a grizzly trampled the ground in that place for a certain period of time, as indicated by the traces on the ground. According to this interpretation, there is no focalization point whatsoever. The same result may be obtained in Ibero-Romance languages by combining PROG with a perfective Past (e.g., Spanish “estuvo + Gerund”). By contrast, Italian gerundial PROG would be absolutely out of place in a similar context.18

In fact, the span of meaning of each PROG device may be even larger than two stages (cf. again Table 3). This is, for instance, the case with Estonian PROG, which is but weakly grammaticalized (Metslang 1995; Tommola, this volume). On the one hand, this construction may at times suggest the persistence of a locative meaning (stage ii); on the other hand, it seems to appear more and more often in focalized contexts (stage iv), possibly under the external influence of other languages such as Finnish (and perhaps English).

4.2. Progressive vs. absentive

The inspection of Table 2 may suggest to us some plausible conclusion concerning the position of ABSV in comparison with PROG. In general, there seems to be little doubt that the ABSV resembles PROG on semantic grounds, as is also proven by the interchangeability of these devices in certain contexts (cf. again example (24)). However, this does not necessarily involve the evolutionary domain. The situation is in fact fairly complex. As may be seen, cell A of Table 2 indicates some kind of solidarity between Dur-PROG and ABSV in contradistinction to Foc-PROG, but cell G presents more of a solidarity between Foc-PROG and ABSV, and the remaining cells exhibit a rather variable situation, where the behaviour of the ABSV approaches one type or the other of PROG, depending on the feature considered. Actually, considering the general characterization of the ABSV as provided in De Groot, this volume, we should expect the relationship to be tighter between Dur-PROG and ABSV than between Foc-PROG and ABSV. However, the fact that Finnish and Faroese are, among the languages known to us, the only ones where PROG and ABSV can be expressed by the same morphosyntactic construction invites the conclusion that an evolutionary link between these grammatical devices may indeed exist, but is unlikely to be the rule.
Let us consider more closely the case of Finnish. As a PROG device, this periphrasis seems to be at a more advanced stage of grammaticalization than its Estonian equivalent, yet it basically spans the same variety of uses. The interesting question is whether this construction started out as ABSV or as PROG. Only a thorough historical investigation could settle the matter. What is clear, though, is that this construction presents some residue of locativity, for it rejects motion verbs such as *ulla* ‘come’ or *menü* ‘go’, which have to be replaced by the corresponding nouns (*ulla, menü*). Now, we observed in the discussion of cell A of Table 2 that locativity is a prominent feature of ABSV constructions. Another prominent feature is agentivity. It is then interesting to note that Finnish PROG, even when used as a true progressive construction, obeys an agentivity constraint, or at least a constraint of intentional control of the event (Heinämaa 1995). For example, a sentence such as *Kyrri tilit on palamassa* ‘the candles are burning’ may only be uttered when one wants to suggest that somebody has lit the candles, with implicit recovering of the hidden agent. Thus, the connections between the two main functions of this periphrasis (PROG and ABSV) appear to be rather evident. But this does not solve the diachronic puzzle. The only thing that may plausibly be said is that the Finnish periphrasis must have entered the developmental path sketched in Table 3 no later than stage (i). In fact, there is even ground to hypothesize that it actually entered at stage (i), for it may be employed with the prototypical stative verb *olla* ‘be’ to convey the meaning of existence, as in: *On olemassa toinen mahdollisuus* ‘there exists another possibility’ (lit.: is be-INF-INESS other possibility). Interestingly, the morphologically identical Estonian periphrasis may be used with an even larger group of statives (Metslild 1995; Tommola, this volume).

In any case, one should not forget that the situation of Finnish and Faroese is rather exceptional. In all other languages in which an ABSV construction has been described there is no morphological coincidence of ABSV and PROG. There is even ground to believe that in some languages, like German and Italian, the ABSV has arisen out of the mere deletion of the Participle, as in: *Er ist einkaufen gegangen → Er ist einkaufen, Er andato a comprare → È a comprare* ‘he is shopping’ (lit.: he is gone (to buy)). Thus, in most cases the semantic proximity of ABSV and PROG, as it emerges in Table 2, although not accidental, may be the effect of the overall similarity of the contexts in which these grammatical devices appear, rather than the result of a true evolutionary convergence.

5. A glance towards Eastern Europe: Altaic languages

The investigation of progressives, which was started rather late in the Tense-Aspect Group, concentrated on the better known European languages. As progressives have not been much investigated for European languages except English, the inclusion of lesser known languages depended on the availability of some expertise. Besides for the languages treated in the individual articles, we received questionnaires for Basque, Armenian, Kalmyk and Karachai. We have nothing new to say about the first two, but we do want to present some data from Kalmyk and Karachai for the following reasons: Kalmyk uses four different forms (besides a general imperfective and a habitual), where English has one and other Germanic languages have two forms. Karachai is one of the languages for which one form (*ib tur-*) has been claimed to have both progressive and perfect meaning, which gave rise to a corresponding question in the theoretical part of the PROGQ (II, 1j).

5.1. Kalmyk

As little is known about the function of Kalmyk TA-forms and as the terms used in the available descriptions are of little help, the questionnaire data were difficult to evaluate. The most useful source was Blasing (1984); without his numerous text examples the interpretation of the questionnaire data would not have been possible. The forms to be briefly discussed here are (for a more detailed analysis see Ebert, to appear):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>term</th>
<th>traditional name (Benzing 1985)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>Präses I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>Präses, durativum I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG II</td>
<td>Präses, durativum I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contin</td>
<td>Präses III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durative</td>
<td>Präses, durativum II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form used most often in sentences where we expected a progressive form is PROG I (with the Imperfective suffix in present time contexts). It occurs, for instance, in PROGQ: 1, 6–17, 19–27 (cf. Table 4):
- with agentive verbs: *ter ködli-jana* ‘she is working’ (PROGQ: 1)
- with non-agentive verbs: *usn budi-jana* ‘the water is boiling’ (PROGQ: 37)
- with motion verbs: *har-chana* ‘is going out’ (PROGQ: 21)
- with phasal verbs: *küće-jänä* ‘is finishing’ (PROGQ: 26)
- with temporary states: *ülän xoroord zogs-jana* ‘is standing by the door’ (PROGQ: 58)

It was not used with stative verbs or with the stative component of initio-transformation verbs (*med-ne* ‘knows’ – PROGQ: 39), and not with limiting temporal adverbials (PROGQ: 48). *-jan* combines with finite and nonfinite TAM suffixes, e.g.,
The form -f +băă is seldom used and does not figure in the PROGQ. However, if motion is involved, a PROG II periphrasis with the verb jov- ‘go’ is preferred: erad kür-č jovna ‘is reaching the top’ (PROGQ: 31). (The verb for ‘go around, be in motion’ is commonly used as a postural verb in periphrastic constructions; cf. also Germanic (Ebert, this volume a)). Combinations with other verbs (umš-ʃ suuna ‘sits reading’, un-ʃ kevna ‘lies sleeping’) are extremely rare. There is not a single occurrence in the questionnaire or in the text examples of the various sources. Both -Jana and -ʃ jovna can be found in generic or habitual contexts (Blasing 1984: 19).

The imperfective participle in -a (-ha after vowels) followed by a form of băă - in non-present contexts, was used in three sentences of the PROGQ:23 nam geril-ā ‘the sun is shining’ (PROGQ: 36), kōdht-ā băă ‘was still working’ (PROGQ: 3), and bi xotan ke-ʃ hă băăxv ‘I will still be cooking’ (PROGQ: 83). Two of the questionnaire sentences contained the adverb ‘still’, which signals that the situation has been going on for some time. This is confirmed by other examples in the literature; cf. ter oda čiγa surhul sur-ʃ ‘er studiert noch’ (Benzing 1985: 128), xuur saak kevän or-ʃ ‘rain is/ keeps falling’ (Todaeva 1968: 46). The use of the a-form resembles the ‘continuative’ in Lezgian (Hapselmath 1993: 145). We tentatively adopt the term here, although an explicit notion of continuativity is not always implied; PROGQ: 83 is not equivalent to ‘I will go on cooking’. The Continuative is compatible with focalizing contexts such as PROGQ: 3 and 83, but also with habituality.24 We therefore do not consider it to be a Foc-PROG.

The fourth form to be considered, -ad băă-, specifies actionality. We have little explicit information on the actionality of Kalmyk verbs, but if the Kalmyk-Russian dictionary gives a Perfective-Imperfective pair for a Kalmyk lexeme, we can be quite sure that we are dealing with a two-phase verb;25 e.g., suux ‘sit; sit down’, āăx ‘be afraid; become afraid’, ʃatx ‘burn, sparkle; start to burn’. A form like satad băă-specifies the non-transformative meaning component ‘burn, be sparkling’.

But -ad băă serves not only to build new lexemes, as Blasing claims. It can indicate various types of durative situations, like continuativity, iterativity, graduability,

Table 4. Forms used in the PROGQquestionnaire. The numbers on the left refer to the questionnaire sentences, as specified in the Appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kalmyk</th>
<th>Karachay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-la</td>
<td>-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>IPFV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>DUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-ad băă</th>
<th>-a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>IPFV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUR</td>
<td>RES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1       | +         |
| 6-17    | +         |
| 44,45,47| +         |
| 33-35   | +         |
| 37-38   | +         |
| 46      | MOT+      |
| 31      | MOT+      |
| 2       | +         |
| 4       | +         |
| 3,83    | +         |
| 36      | +         |
| 18      | +         |
| 62      | +         |
| 48      | +         |
| 49      | +         |
| 50      | +         |
| 60      | +         |
| 70b     | +         |
| 81-82   | +         |
| 73      | -n băă+?  |
| 76      | ++        |
| 77      | (+)       |
| 39      | +         |
| 40      | +         |
| 42      | +         |
| 29,59   | +         |
| 58      | +         |
| 28      | +         |
| 54      | (+)       |
| 55      | (+)       |
| 57      | (+)       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) focalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44,45,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) habitual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44,45,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) duration (liter.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) temporal limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) inclusive reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) imperative, negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g) stative verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h) postural verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29,59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i) telic verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kalmyk    Karachay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-ja-</th>
<th>-na</th>
<th>-a-</th>
<th>-ad bää-</th>
<th>-a- tur-</th>
<th>-a-</th>
<th>-ib tur-</th>
<th>-ib-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>DUR</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>DUR</td>
<td>RES</td>
<td>RES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**j motion verbs**

21  +      + MOT   + MOT  go out just now
22  + MOT  + MOT  fly to
66-67 + go tomorrow

**k) phasal verbs**

23/25 + begin
24/26 + finish

* köh-lj ıga bää-j
* sng-r-n gi-ja-lài (die-CONV SAY-SIM-ANT) 'was about to die'

() forms judged less good by the informant

or simply extended duration. All postural verbs are possible in this form, which often corresponds to the postural verb construction in Germanic languages (d). It is compatible with the Perfective (e) and even with the Progressive (f):

(33) Kalmyk

a. naad-\-a bää-\-ña 'continues playing' (Todaeva 1976: 154)

b. end-tendän xääl-\-häd jow-na 'is looking here and there' (Bläning 1984: 25)

c. ükmärmd <QString>ārg\-h idš-ād jow-là 'the cows were grazing in the meadows' (PROGQ: 62)

d. ter disserta\-san \-b\-c-\-a s\-u\-a-na 'she is [sits] writing her dissertation' (PROGQ: 18)

e. casn nama kùcùnd xääl-\-ād bää-\-v 'the snow melted slowly in the force of the sun' (Bläning 1984: 25)

f. Oczyr Kidt or-\-a jow-\-\-Ja \-na 'Oer was travelling in China ...' (Bläning 1984: 27)

Unlike the Germanic postural verb forms, the Durative was not used in focalized contexts (cf. Table 3). This and the combinability with Progressive show, that it is an actional periphrasis and does not qualify as a Dur-PROG.

5.2. Karachai

Our material for Karachai is very limited and the interpretation of the data must therefore remain rather tentative. The great advantage of the Karachai questionnaire is that the informant gives all possible translations — sometimes up to five different forms — and often comments on their degree of acceptability. The forms to be considered here are:

- Imperfective -a-(-\-y-) (simultaneous convert)
- Progressive -a-(-\-y-) tur-\-bar- (simultaneous convert + 'be'/go')
- Resultative I -ib- (antecedent convert)
- Resultative II -ib tur- (antecedent convert + 'be')
- Durative -ib tur-\-bar-\(.\) (antecedent convert + 'be'/go' ...)

In the typical progressive contexts (e.g. PROGQ: 6-20), the informant used the PROG marked by -a tur-, usually besides an Imperfective; e.g., with

- agentive and non-agentive verbs: su\-u k\-'aya\-n \-a tur-\-a-\-dì (boil-SIM be-IPFV-3\-SG)
  'the water is boiling' (PROGQ: 37),
- motion verbs: čïg-\-\-a t\-a\-d-p / \-a bar- \-'is just going out' (PROGQ: 21),
- phasal verbs: \-\-ib bo\-ša\-\-y \-a t\-a\-d-p 'is finishing teaching' (PROGQ: 26),
- temporary state: bil\-\-dir-e tura\-siz 'you (PL) are being nice' (PROGQ: 42).

It was not used with postural verbs denoting a temporary state (PROGQ: 28, 58), and not with true states (bil-\-\-dį 'knows').

In contrast to Kalmyk -a bää-, the parallel Karachai form with the anterior convert in -ib was used almost as often as PROG in the questionnaire. This form is sometimes claimed to have resultative, perfect or progressive/actual present function (Nedjalkov & Nedjalkov 1987: 114).

In most occurrences of the PROGQ, the form in -ib tur- is comparable to Kalmyk -a bää-, i.e., it serves as an actional specifier. Often it is listed together with the simple form as a lexical unit in the dictionary; e.g., Russ. sidet' 'sit (ipfv)': ol\-\-t\-a tur-\-\-a; Russ. spat- 'sleep (ipfv)': džuk-tur-\-t\-a; džuk-\-a b tur-\-\-a; Russ. deržat' 'hold (ipfv)': tugur \-a, tug-\-\-tur-\-\-a.'

(34) Karachai (PROGQ: 3)

Dźon kel-\-gen-in-de, Anna alk'ın džukla-\-b
John come-PF-POSS-LOC Anna still sleep-ANT-CONV
\-a-dî / džukla-\-a\-dî
be-IPFV-3\-SG / sleep-IPFV-3\-SG
'When John came, Anna was still sleeping.'

Postural verbs in actual present contexts were translated with three different forms:

(35) Karachai

olt\-\-t\-a / ol\-\-tur-\-ub tur-\-a-dî / ol\-\-tur-\-ub-dî 'is sitting' (PROGQ: 28)
\-\-str-e-\-di / \-\-str-ib tur-\-a-dî / \-\-str-ib-\-di 'is standing' (PROGQ: 59)
IPFV IPFV/RES II RES I
The Imperfective is formed from the stative meaning component of the initio-transformative verbs *oltur-* 'sit down, sit', *ściel-* 'stand up, stand', or from the composite verbs *olturab tur-*:, *ścielis tur-*:. The Resultative is formed from the transformative meaning component. The second form is structurally ambiguous, although the denotive content is identical: it is either a RES II of the verbs *oltur-, *ściel-, or an IPFV of the verbs *olturab tur-, *ścielis tur-,. There is no progressive and no perfect meaning involved in this ambiguity.

The Durative is used with all types of verbs except momentaneous ones, and exhibits the same range of meanings as the Kalmyk Durative. With accomplishment verbs the informant prefers the auxiliary *bar-* 'go, move', probably to avoid the ambiguity which *-ib tur-* can create with these verbs.

(36) **Karachai**

a. (PROGQ: 57)²⁸
   k'art ölt-ib bar-a édi.
   old_man die-ANT.CONV go-SIM.CONV was
   'The old man was dying.'

b. (PROGQ: 55)
   ... k'ar uak'-uak' dżer-ni dżab-ib
   snow slowly-slowly ground-ACC cover-ANT.CONV
   bar-a édi.
   go-SIM.CONV was
   '... snow was gradually covering the ground.'

The Durative is not excluded in habitual contexts; e.g., *ol kitab ok'u-y-dí* (IPFV) *ok'ib turadi* (DUR) 'she reads [every Saturday]' (PROGQ: 2), and it can be combined with a PROG.

(37) **Karachai** (PROGQ: 27)
Ol xarap-ni ayt-ib bar-a tur-a-dí.
sh she story-ACC tell-ANT.CONV go-SIM.CONV be-IPFV-3SG
'She is continuing telling a story.'

In the PFQ the *-ib tur-* form was used only with telic predicates. Still, not all (non-durative) *-ib tur-* forms can be interpreted as resultatives. Nedjalkov & Nedjalkov (1987) found that the test adverb *alk'in* 'still' can not be inserted before *-ib tur-* forms from active transitive verbs,²⁹ i.e., there seem to be no possessive resultatives. (38) has perfect meaning only:

(38) **Karachai** (Nedjalkov & Nedjalkov 1987: 116)
Aṣa ešik (*alk'in*) ač-ib tur-a-dí.
father door still close-CONV be-IPFV-3SG
'Father has closed the door.'

*alk'in* was also rejected with some intransitive verbs, e.g., *ol (*alk'in*) ketib turadi* 'he has come'. The resultative *-ib tur-* form thus goes the common way towards a perfect meaning (the perfect in *-gan* develops towards a preterite). Which verbs allow a resultative interpretation is not predictable. Nedjalkov & Nedjalkov list 15 verbs (out of 400 they tested) for which they claim actual present meaning with *-ib tur-*, among them the postural verbs, but also 'sow', 'plough', 'graze (trans.)', 'fish'. We do not see any reason to interpret the *-ib tur-* form in *ol kiyim ťigib turadi* 'she sews / is sewing dresses' different from the durative forms.

6. Conclusions

Of the four forms used in the Kalmyk PROGQ, two (*V + -jana and V + -f bāā-fjov-*) can be classified as Foc-PROG, although they show some signs of defocalization. Karachai has only one Foc-PROG form (*-a tur-*). The Kalmyk imperfective participle form in *-a* is a rare subtype of the imperfective dimension which expresses that a situation holds at a point of reference and for some time before. It could probably be located somewhere between Foc-PROG and Dur-PROG. In both languages the form made up of the anterior or verb + postural verb marks various types of durative activity. The Karachai form in *-ib tur-* (and no other auxiliary) is also a resultative, often with perfect meaning. There is no evidence in our data that the durative forms can have progressive function. Unlike the Germanic postural verb constructions, which were classified as instances of Dur-PROG, the Kalmyk and Karachai duratives can be combined with a progressive and are not suitable to mark focalization.

The situation is similar in other Turkic languages (Schöning 1984: 324, Johanson 1971, 1995). In Tatar the combination of the verb in *-p + postural verb* is an actional periphrasis specifying the phasal meaning of fini-transformative and initio-transformative verbs, while other auxiliaries specify the transformational meaning component, e.g.,

(39) **Tatar**
ul-ep kit-te
die-CONV go_away-PT:3
'he died'
vs.
ül-ep yat-ti
die-CONV lie-PT:3
'he was dying'

kür-ep al-dî
see-CONV take-PT:3
'he saw (discovered)'
vs.
kür-ep tor-dî
see-CONV be/stand-PT:3
'he saw'

The simultaneous verb in -a together with tor- 'be, stand' has been grammaticalized as a progressive, ruling out combinations of -a with other postural verbs (Schöning 1984: 277). Several authors mention that constructions with -p tor- and -p uṭūr- ('sit') can also mark an actual present and thus come close in meaning to the progressive. The form also expresses perfect meaning: uqīp tor-dî 'has read'. Kunym has actional periphrases with actionally ambiguous, but also with activity verbs: yuxlap tur- 'sleep', aṣap tur- 'eat', oxup tur- 'read'. The Imperfective from these complex lexemes is formally identical to the Resultative: e.g., oxup tura 'reads', gelip tura 'is/has come' (cf. Johanson 1995 and to appear).

The Altaic forms are not unlike those in Western European languages. Simultaneous verbs or participles + auxiliary (< postural verb) yield progressives, anterior convorb or participles + auxiliaries yield resultatives and perfects. Postural verbs are used in durative periphrases. There are, however, some important differences: combinations of verb + auxiliary have been lexicalized to a considerable degree in Altaic languages. In Western European languages such lexicalizations are rare and mainly restricted to non-agentive verbs (e.g., Eng. be tired, Germ. umgeben von). The durative periphrases (at least in Kalmyk and Karachai) are not used in focalization and are therefore no instances of Dur-PROG. A further difference results from the weak notion of anteriority associated with the convorb -ad-, -ib, which allows them to be used much like simultaneous forms. This leads to a further characteristic of some Turkic languages, namely that one form can have resultative/perfect and durative function.

Notes

1. This work was jointly developed by the three authors. However, CaG bears the main responsibility for Sections 1 and 2, PMB for Sections 3 and 4, and KE for Section 5.

2. An apparent counterexample could be the Albanian construction with the particle po (cf. fn. 3). However, the meaning of this particle is not strictly temporal; thus, it represents a different type.

3. For our purposes, the classification proposed by Blansitt turned out to be more insightful than, for instance, the classification by Bybee et al. (1994: 128–129), which on the one hand refers to morphological devices not used by European languages (such as "reduplication"), and on the other hand is mostly oriented towards identifying the possible sources of the progressive (a preoccupation which does not concern us here).

4. The particle po is considered to be an intensifier by Duchet (1995). Indeed, besides forming PROG in combination with the Present or the Imperfect, it may have a purely intensifying function when used with other tenses or other grammatical forms (like pronouns). However, its service as a PROG marker is well established. Albanian has another way of expressing progressivity, namely the construction 'be' + Gerund (Camaj 1984):

(i) Albanian
Zogitë janë duke sjellë kandra në qer dhe.
'Verra jëndëjë është duke sjellë qendrat në qer dhe.'

The birds are bringing insects to their nest.'

In Geg, the Gerund-building form is the rather than duke. Note however that in Northern Geg PROG is preferably expressed by the construction 'be' + kah + inflected verb (where kah is a preposition meaning 'towards'). Apparently, the latter construction is both a PROG marker and a marker of imminuality (Alexander Murzaku, p.c.). In Arbëresh (a Tosk variety spoken by the Albanian minority in Italy). PROG takes the form of 'be' + e + inflected verb (where e is the conjunction) or 'be' + qe + inflected verb (where qe is a complementizer analogous to English 'that'), its actual realization varying from dialect to dialect (Francesco Altimari, p.c.). In some Arbëresh varieties one finds also the periphrasis vete ('go') + Gerund (Breu 1982), which apparently has the same functions as the analogous constructions to be found in several Romance languages (cf. the "Motion auxiliary type" in Table 1).

5. It is also possible to use other verbs as auxiliaries, such as egen 'stay', ibili 'walk, function/work', ihardun 'keep doing something', again combined with the Imperfective Participle. However, the use of these constructions is dialectically bound.

The inessence of nominal forms substitutes for the Imperfective Participle in certain cases (PROQ:1, 35: ametsetan 'dreaming', lit. 'in dreams'). Sometimes, both possibilities (verbal and nominal) coexist: e.g., hitzeten ari da or hitzetan ari da 'she is talking'; hitzeten 'talk' (lit. do talk (Participle)), hitzetan 'in the talk' (cf. PROQ:34, 45). Still another possibility (cf. PROQ:51) is offered by nominal forms with the instrumental suffix combined with ibili 'walk' or joan 'go' as conjugated forms (note that no sense of motion is implied in these cases).

A few verbs do not have the analytic construction in ari, but present synthetic forms that are used with the Present and the Preterite: izan 'be', egen 'stay', joan 'go', etori 'come', ibili 'walk', eduki 'have', ekari 'bring', eraman 'take (somewhere)', erobili 'use', jakin 'know', ihardun 'keep doing something', and some other relatively unproductive ones. These synthetic forms can take the progressive meaning in the appropriate contexts. However, with some of these verbs the analytic construction is gaining ground, as in jakiten ari naiz (lit.: I am knowing) vs. dokit 'I know'. (Data from Miren Lourdes Oñederra, p.c.)
Since this is a potential source of misunderstanding, we would like to clarify the conventions that we are going to adopt in this chapter. When referring to the distinction Perfective/Imperfective, as used in the grammatical descriptions of Slavic languages, we shall use capital initials. When this convention is not used, these terms should be intended as they usually are in the grammatical descriptions of Germanic, Romance etc. We refer the reader to Bertinetto & Delfitto (this volume), for a detailed discussion of this topic, and a possible terminological distinction, whereby the terms ‘bounded/unbounded’ are used in the former sense, and ‘terminative/nonterminative’ in the latter. However, as the authors make clear, the need for this disambiguation arises only in particular situations. When not strictly necessary (i.e., when there is no real danger of misunderstanding), the traditional terminology can be retained. Cf. also Johanson (this volume), for a thorough clarification of the aspetual matter. Still with respect to terminology, the reader should be aware that we use the word ‘actional’ as the adjective corresponding to ‘actionality’ (i.e. Aktionsart).

As observed in Bertinetto, this volume, the Italian PROG device based on motion verbs (cf. Table 1) is almost uniquely used in formal styles.

Bliansit (1975:3) refers to Chafe (1970) for the notion of “generic progressive” (exemplified by John is playing golf once a week), but also quotes Bee (1973) for the distinction between the two meanings of He is eating, which may indicate either a currently occurring event, or the fact that someone is again able to eat after a severe illness. In addition, Bliansit (p. 4) notes that there is an “intensive durative” construction, somehow related to the progressive, as in He is reading away, which may correspond to Spanish Estás lees y lee. This type resembles the hyperbolic uses of PROG, exemplified by Eng. He is always reading or Spanish Estás siempre leyendo (cf. examples (11) in Bertinetto, this volume).

A situation where an event overlaps with a simultaneously ongoing process was called “Inzidenzschema” by Pollak (1960: 129); cf. “a relation between a dynamic situation and a point in time” in Dahl (1985: 91), and Comrie (1976: 3), where this kind of situation is used to illustrate imperfective (progressive) as opposed to perfective aspect in certain languages.

In Hungarian, Perfective verbs cannot be used with the ABSV (de Groot 1995), although, as shown in (21b), they appear in progressive contexts (cf. Section 2.6 for our remarks). But the contradiction is only apparent; one should not confuse Perfective with perfective (cf. again fn. 6 for our notational conventions). The incompatibility of Perfective verbs with the ABSV is an obvious consequence of the fact that this construction depicts a situation as occurring at a particular reference interval, and thus concerns an event that cannot be viewed as completed.

As to the contrast between Sp. estou leyendo/ha estado leyendo todo el dia on the one side, and Eng. he has been studying the whole day, cf. Bertinetto & Delfitto (this volume, Section 3.2).

As shown by Ebert, this volume a, in some Germanic languages this constraint takes the form of an “intentionality” requirement, or in some cases of a “dynamism” requirement. In particular, prepositional periphrases (cf. Table 1) are preferred with higher dynamicty (cf. table 3 in Ebert, this volume a), and are in general more readily available with a focalized interpretation. Among the Germanic languages considered, only Icelandic seems immune from this component; but significantly, the PROG construction of Icelandic is, together with that of English, the most grammaticalized one within the Germanic group. As to the variable strength of the agentive/intentional requirement with the ABSV, cf. De Groot (this volume).

13. An apparent exception is represented by the Swedish ABSV construction, which may be based on the inherently passive auxiliary blir (De Groot, this volume). But one may contend that in this construction the original passive meaning of the auxiliary is bleached.

14. Needless to say, our observations do not refer to those PROG or ABSV periphrases that are normally constructed with an Infinitive governed by the copula with the possible help of a preposition (for the relevant morphological data, see Table 1 here and De Groot, this volume). Whether or not a PROG construction based on the Infinitive in the main verb may also admit the Infinitive in the auxiliary verb depends on the given language. For instance, when PROG is governed by a modal verb, Standard Portuguese presents the Infinitive in both the copula and the main verb.

15. Interestingly, Germ. gerade is also indicated by some scholars as a PROG device. But see the contrary opinion expressed by Ebert, this volume a. In fact, one should note that gerade can be employed in stative, i.e. clearly non-progressive, contexts (such as: Er ist gerade da), whereas Alb. po is rejected in the same contexts. As to the expression of PROG in Albanian, cf. fn. 4.

16. Note, however, that the permanent stative (or individual-level) interpretation of example (25b) presupposes an equative, rather than a locative meaning of the copula. Thus, there are grounds to believe that there are in fact two possible sources for progressive periphrases, incorporating an existential-locative meaning or an existential-equative meaning respectively, with the latter converging with the former at some later stage. Another hypothesis that one could plausibly put forth is that stage (i) constitutes an entirely independent evolutionary path. Accordingly, one could suppose that the periphrases of stage (ii) exploited an already existing morphosyntactic structure, which had become available for a different usage. However, this hypothesis is weakened by the fact that the same development has made its appearance in two fairly heterogeneous languages, Latin and Old English.

Note finally that PROG constructions based on motion verbs presumably enter the evolutionary path directly at stage (ii), for the purely stative meaning typical of stage (i) is alien to the inherent semantic import of these verbs.

17. Examples of PROG devices implementing the initial phase of stage (ii) may still be found in Modern Romance languages. This is to be observed for instance in:

(i) Italian
Che ci stai a fare?
What there stand:2SG:PRS at do
‘What are you doing here/there?’

(ii) Spanish
Todos los días estás una hora escribiendo.
all the days be:PRS:2SG one hour writing
‘You write one hour every day.’
The periphrasis in (i) is similar to the Italian infinitival PROG (cf. Table 1 and Bertinetto, this volume), but differs from it in that it includes an explicitly locative morpheme. As to (ii), it may easily be confused with Spanish copular PROG, but its syntactic behaviour is different, as shown by negation (Luis García Fernández, p.c.):

(iii) Spanish

a. Está escribiendo.
   be:3SG:PRS writing
   'S/he is writing.'

b. No está escribiendo. / *Está sin escribir.
   not be:3SG:PRS writing be:3SG:PRS without write
   'S/he is not writing.'

c. Está una hora escribiendo.
   be:3SG:PRS one hour writing
   'S/he spends one hour writing.'

d. No está una hora escribiendo. / Está una hora
   not be:3SG:PRS one hour writing be:3SG:PRS one hour
   sin escribir.
   without write
   'S/he does not spend one hour writing / S/he remains for one hour without writing.'

In (d), the presence of the temporal adverbial allows for the negation with sin, which is not admitted in (b) with progressive meaning. What is particularly remarkable is that the auxiliary in (c–d) preserves by and large its original, locative meaning (thus, it is not a true auxiliary). The same applies to the Italian construction "starse en a + Infinitive", which exhibits a verb with an explicit locative meaning preceding the prepositional Infinitive. In both cases, there is the implication that the event takes place in a specific place.

18. Even in Catalan there is a tendency to avoid PROG in a context like this. But the usage of PROG is in general slightly more restricted in Catalan than in the other Ibero-Romance languages (Bertinetto, this volume).

19. The same remark is put forth for Breton PROG by Hewitt (1985/86).

20. Note that this is not always the case. In Dutch, for instance, when the adverb heen is present, the Participle may not be added:

(i) Dutch

Ze zijn heen aardappels rooien (*gegaan).
   they are away potatoes dig:INF gone
   'They are off digging up potatoes.'

21. We thank Igor and Vladimir Nedjalkov, who translated the questionnaire into Russian, as well as B. A. Bieev and A. I. Xasanov, both trained linguists and native speakers of Kalmyk and Karachay respectively, for their collaboration.

22. The term "Präens" applies to forms with the suffix -na: -Jama Präens duratvum L. -ad bātānd Präens duratvum II. The combination of -na with the past/anterior marker -la is called Imperfectum III (p. 39), with FUT -ax Präens II (-Jax does not occur in my data); -ad bātā + PVF -v is called Imperfectum I.

23. This form is rare also in texts; cf. Todaeva (1976: 159), Bläsing (1984: 75).


25. This does not hold vice-versa. For fini-transformatives the dictionary is very careful to give only imperfective translations. Apparently Russian linguists expect telic/perfective verbs to be marked morphologically, and consequently they describe only verbs marked with telecizers like -čet as "perceptive".

26. A dual progressive-perfect function has been claimed also for Khalkha Mongolian -aad bai-, but the only example found in articles and texts with a perfect meaning is ir-eeed bain 'has come'. Otherwise -aad bai- is a durative periphrasis, like Kalmyk -ad būu- (cf. Ebert 1995: 196).

27. There seems to be no big semantic difference between RES I and RES II: whenever the informant used RES I, he also gives a RES II form as an alternative, though not vice versa. RES I seeni to be rare. In the PFQ it was given only as one of several possibilities in: ol uyan-ib-di (RES I) | uyam-ib turadi (RES II) 'he woke up already' (PFQ: 30–31).

28. The progressives öle tura edi and džaba tura edi were considered "worst" in those examples.

29. The authors claim that resultatives can be formed from a few transitive active verbs, but the only example given, ol kitab-ni alk' in al-ib turadi 's/he is still holding the book' is most probably an actional periphrasis of the initio-transformative verb al- 'take, hold'.
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The progressive in Romance, as compared with English

1. Prolegomena

This chapter collapses two apparently disparate entities: the Romance languages and a single language belonging to the Germanic group. This might be considered inappropriate from a strictly genetic point of view. But the typological perspective that we are assuming in this series of contributions justifies such a move. In fact, this solution should not even appear particularly surprising, given the fact that English is, among the Germanic languages, the one that has most dramatically departed from the other languages of the group as a result of the protracted contact with French in a crucial phase of its history. But what matters most is that, regarding the particular phenomenon we are going to discuss here (i.e. the progressive), the languages under consideration present deep affinities. It can easily be shown that Germanic languages other than English exhibit quite different features, as illustrated in the companion chapter by Karen Ebert (this volume). It has even been claimed that the English progressive was shaped by the Romance model. However, the alternative view, according to which this construction represents an autonomous development, is equally defendable (Schefter 1975). This issue of course needs to be addressed in proper terms, namely through the comparative investigation of ancient texts (to the extent that they provide evidence for the crucial period). Here I shall disregard it, and merely concentrate on the observable synchronic situation, characterized by strong similarities between Romance and English, be it a matter of common origin or of mere convergence.

A clarification is in order at the outset. We have to distinguish between “progressive” as a semantic notion and as a formal manifestation (i.e. a morphosyntactic device). To convey the latter sense, I shall use the abbreviation PROG (except when I cite the traditional grammatical denomination of a given tense, such as, e.g., the English “Present Progressive”). Although in many cases there is a reciprocal implication, this is not always so. Consider Romance languages, where the progressive aspect is not necessarily conveyed by specialized morphosyntactic devices (namely periphrases), for the mere usage of imperfective tenses is in most cases perfectly adequate. And this is not the only complication. In fact, on the one hand we find prototypical contexts where the notion “progressive” is necessarily present indepen-