The Present Marker -te iru

Christoffer Ahrling

Abstract

The present thesis is concerned with the marker *-te iru* in Japanese, which has been thought to have the interpretations progressive, resultative, habitual, perfect (or experiential), and progressive through iteration, or any given subset of these interpretations according to various scholars. The matter is a complicated one, with particularly the perfect interpretation proving to be difficult to explain, as it refers to a past event rather than a current situation.

After an intial overview of the various approaches seen in earlier research, including temporal, aspectual, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic considerations, the previous research is discussed in the context of new research. Within this discussion it is noted that *-te iru* appears to have a standard interpretation of referring to only a current situation, and that in-sentence context is required for any other interpretation. On the basis of this discussion it is proposed that *-te iru* is a present marker that marks a situation holding at present, and that in the cases where the situation referred to by the verb is a past one, perfect meaning obtains as a result of the sentence referring to two distinct but related situations simultaneously, where the present situation is implied by the presence of *-te iru* without a situation compatible with its meaning as a present marker.

Acknowledgements

I would like to properly thank the people whose involvement in this thesis has been imperative to its completion. First and foremost, I would like to thank Yukiko Karlsell for acting as my informant, and for showing such great patience while being interviewed. The information she provided has been absolutely crucial. I would also like to thank Annamaria Sjöberg, Jens Mattsson, and Emil Mårup for providing valuable feedback. Their contributions have helped in bringing this thesis to what is hopefully a passable level, but any remaining errors are mine and mine alone.

Contents

Conventions and Abbreviations

Glossing and Romanization

The glossing in this essay roughly corresponds to the Leipzig glossing rules. Romanization of Japanese characters follows the Hepburn system. Long vowels are indicated by doubled vowel letters (*kinoo*) rather than macrons.

Typographical Conventions

Italics mark Japanese sentences outside of examples. Single quotes denote English translations of Japanese sentences. Double quotes are used for citations. Proper names may be written in a way corresponding to the standard use in the west (e.g. Tokyo rather than Tookyoo), and they may also be written differently in the translation compared to in the romanization for similar reasons (e.g. Taroo vs. Taro).

Abbreviations

ACC	Accusative
ASP	Aspect
COP	Copula
GEN	Genitive
LOC	Locative
NOM	Nominative
NPST	Nonpast
PAST	Past
PL	Plural
SFP	Sentence final particle
TOP	Topic

Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 The topic

The present thesis is concerned with a construction in Japanese whereby a verb can be combined with the marker *-te iru* to receive different interpretations.

The Japanese marker *-te iru* as most students of basic Japanese know it is a progressive marker. It denotes that a situation is ongoing at utterance time. As can be seen below, *-te iru* in this context can be used both for situations that are fairly long in terms of duration, as with example (2) where it may apply for a whole lifetime, as well as for situations that likely last for less than an hour, possibly a few minutes, as with examples (1) and (3). There is no inherent difference between uses that denote a particularly long period of time and ones that denote a rather much smaller period of time, but it should be noted that it must be a period of time rather than an instant.

(1)   Shinji wa   hashi-tte iru.
        Shinji TOP run-TE I.NPST
        'Shinji is running.'

(2)   Shinji wa   Tokyo ni   sun-de iru.
        Shinji TOP Tokyo LOC   live-TE I.NPST
        'Shinji lives in Tokyo.'

(3)   Shinji wa   Taroo o   nagu-tte iru
        Shinji TOP Taro ACC   punch-TE I.NPST
        'Shinji is punching Taro.'

Now, in the below example (4), it would be perfectly reasonable given what we now know of *-te iru* to assume that the sentence means that Shinji is dying. This is, however, false. What actually obtains is that Shinji is already dead.

(4)   Shinji wa   shin-de iru
        Shinji TOP dead-TE I.NPST
        'Shinji is dead.'
        *'Shinji is dying.'

This particular use of *-te iru* is commonly referred to as resultative. It differs from the plain past tense in that it focuses on the current state of being dead rather than the time of death itself.

Another use of *-te iru* is to mark that a certain action is a habit or that it tends to occur at somewhat regular intervals.

(5)   Shinji wa   mainichi   go kiro o   hashi-tte iru.
        Shinji TOP every day   five kilometers ACC   run-TE I.NPST
        'Shinji runs five kilometers every day.'

Finally, it can be used to mark a past event that holds bearing on the present one way or another. I will refer to this as perfect.

(6)   Shinji wa   jukken   mo   ie o   tate-te iru.
        Shinji TOP ten   as many as house ACC   build-TE I.NPST
        'Shinji has built five houses.'

The above sentence can, amongst other things, be used to indicate that as Shinji has built ten houses in the past, he should be capable of building another one. It should be noted that, unlike with the resultative form listed above, a wide variety of interpretations with regards to what it relates to at utterance time can occur with this sentence. It could be that as Shinji has built ten houses, he has grown tired of the process, and doesn't want to do it again. It could also be used in a situation where Shinji is showing clear signs of back pain to explain why that is.

It should also be noted that *-te iru* can be used in the past tense, adding the past tense marker *-ta*, taking the form *-te ita*.

(7)   Shinji wa   hashi-tte ita.
        Shinji TOP run-TE I.PAST
        'Shinji was running.'

1.2 Structure and Methodology

This thesis has two primary goals. The first goal is to provide an overview of the research that has been conducted in this field up until the present. This will be presented in chapter 2. The second goal is to attempt to illuminate on the function of *-te iru*, specifically that of its perfect interpretation, and will be discussed in chapter 3. Here I will lay out the results of an interview conducted with a native speaker of Japanese, and discuss the implications of them. I will then put

forth theories on how and why *-te iru* receives a perfect interpretation, and relate these observations to prior research, before summarizing my findings and concluding the thesis in chapter 4. The interview was conducted using both example sentences from my sources and my own examples.

Chapter 2
Prior Research

2.1 Temporal aspect

A wide variety of methods by which to account for the different interpretations *-te iru* receives has been proposed, dating back to Matsushita (1924) proposing that it is dependent upon the type of verb used in the construct; specifically, whether it is a punctual verb or a durative one. As can once again be seen in the below examples, *shinu* 'die', a punctual verb, receives resultative interpetation, while *hashiru* 'run', being a durative verb, receives progressive.

(1)   Shinji wa   shin-de iru.
       Shinji TOP die-TE I.NPST
       'Shinji is dead'

(2)   Shinji wa   hashi-tte iru
       Shinji TOP run-TE I.NPST
       'Shinji is running'

It was on this basis that Kindaichi (1950) proposed a four-way classification of Japanese verbs. This classification is based on the meanings verbs receive with *-te iru*. The four categories he defined are:

   I   stative verbs (iru 'is', aru 'is', dekiru 'can'), defined as verbs that cannot be used
   with *-te iru* at all;

   II   durative verbs (hashiru 'run', kaku 'write'), which obtain progressive interpretation
   with *-te iru*;

   III   instantaneous verbs (shinu 'die'), which obtain resultative interpretation with *-te
   iru*;

   IV   and fourth category verbs (sobieru 'stand tall', 'soar'), which cannot be used
   without *-te iru* in the main clause.

Within this framework, durative verbs correspond to progressive meaning, and instantaneous verbs with resultative, as suggested by Matsushita. Verbs that are incompatible with *-te iru* have their own separate category, and the same applies to a certain type of verbs which can only be used with *-te iru*, such as *sobieru* 'soar'.

The below example (3) shows the proper usage of *sobieru* with *-te iru*, while (4) is erronous, a s *sobieru* must be used with *-te iru*. Similarly, example (5) is considered faulty, while (6) is felicitous, as *aru* is incompatible with *-te iru*.

(3)   Yama ga   sobie-te iru
       Mountain NOM   stand tall-TE I.NPST
       'The mountain stands tall.'

(4)   *Yama ga   sobieru.
       Mountain NOM   stand tall
       'The mountain stands tall.'

(5)   *Hon ga   a-tte iru.
       Book NOM   is-TE I.NPST
       'There is a book here.'

(6)   Hon ga   aru.
       Book NOM   is.NPST
       'There is a book here.'

Soga (1983) treated the progressive aspect of *-te iru* in a similar manner, stating that "indivisible" verbs, or "verbs which express situations in which the beginnings and endings are perceived to be simultaneous," (Soga 1983:118) will become resultative, but he differed between normal progressive and constructions that become progressive not through duration but through iteration instead.

What he calls the continuous, i.e. progressive, meaning of *-te iru* can be subdivided into interrupted and uninterrupted sentences (Soga 1983:121), where uninterrupted sentences are simple progressive sentence like the one below.

(7)   Shinji wa   hashi-tte iru.
       Shinji TOP run-TE I.NPST
       'Shinji is running.'

However, the following sentence is interrupted but still receives progressive interpretation as a result of describing successive actions.

(8)   Shinji wa   Taroo o   nagu-tte iru.
        Shinji TOP Taro ACC   punch-TE I.NPST
        'Shinji is punching Taro.'

On the other hand, example (9) below, a habitual sentence, is progressive through non-successive repetition.

(9)   Shinji wa   mainichi   Taroo o   nagu-tte iru.
        Shinji TOP every day   Taro ACC   punch-TE I.NPST
        'Shinji punches Taro every day.'

Yoshikawa (1976) also included iterative progressive as a distinct category, but Shirai (2000) treated it as a sub-category of progressive, while still acknowledging its iterative properties. Regardless, it should be noted that *te iru* can be progressive through iteration with repeatable verbs.

The approach favored by Kindaichi is one that primarily relies on the aspectual properties of the verb to determine the meaning that a sentence obtains with *te iru*. It was Fujii (1966) who initially pointed out the contrast between plain resultative sentences and perfect sentences, which are not discriminated within the framework proposed by Kindaichi. While it is true that both denote a current situation that is the result of a past event, it is generally agreed that the interpretations differ from each other. The below examples help elaborate on this point.

(10)   Kanojo wa kekkonshi-te iru.
       She TOP   marry-TE I.NPST
       'She is married.' (Resultative)

(11)   Kanojo wa suisu no   kyookai de   kekkonshi-te iru.
       She TOP   Switzerland GEN   church LOC   marry-TE I.NPST
       'She (has) got married at a church in Switzerland.' (Perfect) (Kudo, 1995:119)

Using these examples, Shirai (2000:335) explains that,

[11] illustrates perfect, and focuses on both the past action and the current relevance of the action, and therefore the *de* adverbial, which only modifies dynamic predicates, can be used (Kudo, 1995). On the other hand, [10] is resultative state, and the focus is on the current state of her being married, and in this sense cannot therefore be used with *de*. If *de* is used for this sentence, the sentence can no longer refer to her being married presently, but rather to the fact of her having got married before, and its current relevance.

Put another way, the plain resultative construction is not concerned with the past event as such, but merely the current situation. That the current situation is a result of a past event is inconsequential to the intended meaning. However, when perfect is used, one is crucially concerned with the past event that has bearing on the current situation as well as the current situation. I will elaborate on the importance of this notion later.

The method Fujii (1966) proposed to determine which meaning obtains was reliant on past time adverbials. Ogiharas (1998:100) application of this is as follows.

I   ɸ-*te iru* has a "current situation" interpretation if ɸ-*te iru* has the same truth condition as ima ('now') ɸ-*te iru*.

II   ɸ-*te iru* has an experiential [perfect] interpretation if adding an appropriate adverbial indicating a past interval (e.g., kinoo 'yesterday', kyonen 'last year') or a completed action/event (e.g., ichido 'once') to ɸ-*te iru* does not change its truth conditions.

Ogiharas application is particularly noteworthy for attempting to integrate the viewpoints of Fujii (1966) and Kindaichi (1950) to account for the observations of both. He claimed that it is only when *-te iru* has a "current situation" interpretation that durativity plays a role in determining the meaning the sentence obtains, and that current situation interpretations occur when the construction is compatible with a present time adverbial. Conversely, compatibility with past time adverbials or completed action events leads to what he refers to as experiential interpretations (I will elaborate on the reasoning behind using the word perfect for this thesis later.) We effectively end up with a system that tests the meaning of the sentence by adding present- or past-time adverbials to see if that changes the truth conditions of the sentence.

Ogiharas model possibly represents the most accurate model that is fundamentally based on Kindaichis work to explain the meanings of *-te iru*, providing a fairly comprehensive overview of the meanings that obtain in a table similar to the one below (Ogihara 1998:101).

Table 1

verb class	current situation *-te iru*	experiential *-te iru*
durative verbs	progressive	experiential
instantaneous verbs	resultative	experiential

The examples below demonstrate all of the possible interpretations of *-te iru* if the model proposed by Ogihara is utilized. As can be seen, the durative verb *hashiru* 'run' receives a progressive interpretation in (12) where it is used with *ima* 'now', while in (14) the same verb receives a perfect interpretation on account of being used with the past-time adverbial *kinoo* 'yesterday'. In the case of *shinu* 'die', the same pattern is observed with resultative meaning as a result of being used with *ima* 'now' in (13) and perfect being seen in (15) where *kinoo* 'yesterday' is used. It is important to note that these are not required to be used in the constructions, but that their compatibility with the truth conditions of the sentence is tested by including them.

(12) Shinji wa   ima   hashi-tte iru.
      Shinji TOP now   run-TE I.NPST
      'Shinji is running.'
      Progressive

(13) Shinji wa   ima   shin-de iru.
      Shinji TOP now   die-TE I.NPST
      'Shinji is dead.'
      Resultative

(14) Shinji wa   kinoo   hashi-tte iru.
      Shinji TOP yesterday   run-TE I.NPST
      'Shinji ran yesterday'
      Experiential/perfect

(15) Shinji wa   kinoo   shin-de iru.
      Shinji TOP yesterday   die-TE I.NPST
      'Shinji is dead since yesterday.'
      Experiential/perfect

Furthermore, it should be noted that Ogihara considers the fourth verbal category proposed by Kindaichi to be a type of defective instantaneous verbs rather than a separate category. With the below example (16), according to Ogihara (1998:101-102), "it is conceivable that a mountain with low altitude became a tall mountain in 1970 as a result of its volcanic activity. Even in this scenario, (17) is ill formed. Therefore, the verbs in question are 'defective' if they are taken to be instantaneous verbs." Consequently, he asserts that while it is pragmatically feasible to use these

verbs without *-te iru*, these constructions will still be considered erronous by native speakers. He also shows that instantaneous verbs and fourth category verbs behave very similarly under various circumstances.

(16) Yama ga   sobie-te iru.
      Mountain NOM   tower-TE I.NPST
      'The mountain stands tall.'

(17) *Yama ga   1970-nen ni   takaku   sobieta
      Mountain NOM   1970-year LOC   tall   tower.PAST
      'The mountain rose in 1970.'

As shown in example (18), *sobieru* is compatible with a situation that holds at present when used in the past tense within a relative clause. The same applies to example (19), which shows an instantaneous verb. In contrast, stative and durative verbs can only refer to past events in such situations, as shown by (20) and (21). On this basis, he claims that fourth category verbs are actually defective instantaneous verbs, and not a separate category.

(18) Taroo wa   takaku   sobieta   yama o   mi-te iru.
      Taro TOP   high   tower.PAST   mountain ACC   see-TE I.NPST
      'Taro is looking at a mountain that stands tall.'

(19) Taroo wa   hyooshi no   yabureta   hon o mo-tte iru.
      Taro TOP   cover GEN   tear.PAST   book-ACC get-TE I.NPST
      'Taro has a book the cover of which is torn.'

(20) Taroo wa   puuru de   oyoida   hito ga   suki da.
      Taro TOP   swimming pool LOC   swim.PAST   person NOM   like COP
      'Taro likes the person who swam in the swimming pool.'

(21) Taroo wa   heya ni   ita hito o   shi-tte iru.
      Taro TOP   room LOC be PAST person ACC   know-TE I.NPST
      'Taro knows the person who was in the room.'

2.2   Syntax

So far I've mostly discussed duration as a determining factor for the meaning *-te iru* obtains, but Okuda (1978a,b) noticed a pattern found in transitive-intransitive verb pairs. Examples of such pairs where a transitive and intransitive verb correspond with each other and are virtually the same with the exception of the usage of either an "a" or an "e" at the end of the verb stem are common in Japanese.

As seen in example (1), the intransitive verb *hajimaru* 'start' receives resultative interpretation in (3), while the transitive verb *hajimeru* in (2) which also translates into 'start' receives progressive in (4), which Okuda claimed cannot be explained with the durative method favored by Kindaichi. Transitive-intransitive pairs such as these are pretty common in Japanese, and Okuda took this pattern as an indication that the subject of the sentence plays a role in what meanings obtain. What he stated was summarized by Shirai (2000:347) as follows: "when *-te iru* is attached, a verb describes the situation of the subject; therefore, when the verb describes the action of the subject, it denotes progressive, and when the verb describes the change in the subject, it denotes resultative state."

(1)   Jugyoo ga   hajimaru.
      Class NOM   start.NPST
      'Class is starting.'

(2)   Sensei ga   jugyoo o   hajimeru.
      Teacher NOM   class ACC   start.NPST
      'The teacher will start/starts the class.'

(3)   Jugyoo ga   hajima-tte iru.
      Class NOM   start-TE I.NPST
      'Class has started.'

(4)   Sensei ga   jugyoo o   hajime-te iru.
      Teacher NOM   class ACC   start-TE I.NPST
      'The teacher is starting the class.'

While the notion of durativity as a determining factor was generally accepted up until this point, this so-called "syntactic" approach (Shirai 2000), so named because of its reliance on the subject, became the de-facto standard post-Okuda. Kudo (1995:72) explains how different meanings obtain as a result of different types of verbs as such.

I	*doosa*
	'action'
	=>progressive

II	*shutai doosa, kyakutai henka*
	'subject's action, object's change'
	=>progressive and resultative

III	*shutai henka*
	'subject's change'
	=>resultative

On the basis that *-te iru* describes the situation of the subject, an action undertaken by the subject will logically become progressive in its interpretation, as seen below. *Hashiru* 'run' is an action undertaken by the subject, and it does receive progressive interpretation, as predicted by Kudo. And *shinu* 'die', a change in the subject, does indeed receive resultative, as predicted.

(5)	Shinji ga	hashi-tte iru
	Shinji TOP run-TE I.NPST
	Shinji is running

(6)	Shinji ga	shin-de iru
	Shinji NOM	die-TE I.NPST
	Shinji is dead

The second category, 'subject's action, object's change', is stated to be compatible with both resultative and progressive. The reason for this is that it involves both an action, on the part of the subject, and a change, on the part of the object.

The notion that syntactic elements alone determine the meaning that obtains was however rejected by Shirai (2000). He instead posited that *-te iru* will "receive its meaning in a way that satisfies both types of constraints, synctactic and temporal."

He further argues that the reason both can usually be satisfied is a consequence of the natural correlation between agentive action and duration as well as change-of-state and punctuality. While agentive actions tend to have a duration, change-of-state verbs tend to be punctual, and he claims that this is what can be observed with transitive-intransitive pairs in Japanese.

11

On account of this observation, he uses Vendlerian aktionsarten to account for the same categories Kudo defined. The original model proposed by Vendler took into account dynamicity, telicity, and punctuality, illustrated below by Shirai (2000:330).

Table 2

State	——————	love, contain, know
Activity	~~~~~~~~~~	run, walk, play
Accomplishment	~~~~~~~~~~X	make a chair, walk to school
Achievement	X	die, drop, win the race

Each of the four categories with corresponding examples is found above. States, such as 'love' and 'know', are not "processes going on in time," and lack the dynamicity of the other three categories. They are also atelic, in that they do not have a "logical endpoint or climax", and they are not punctual. These are demonstrated by verbs such as 'love' and 'know'. Activities are dynamic, but neither telic nor punctual, exemplified by for instance 'run'. Accomplishments are dynamic and telic, but not punctual. The telicity, the logical endpoint, is the crucial difference between them and activities, so for example 'run a mile' would be an accomplishment rather than an activity, since it contains such a logical endpoint. And finally, achievements are dynamic, telic, and punctual – these could be words like 'die', 'drop', etc..

In applying these categories to Kudo's model, he found that activities correspond with the action category, accomplishments to subject's action, object's change, and achievements to subject's change (Shirai 2000).

In addition, the difference between achievements and semelfactives need to be observed, which corresponds to the repeatability argument raised by Soga (1983) (Comrie 1974, Smith 1997). Semelfactives are repeatable single actions that are imperfective, i.e. they have no regard for the internal structure of the situation, but are not strictly punctual the way a change-of-state verb such as *shinu* 'die' is, and with *-te iru* they obtain progressive interpretation through iteration, and thus correspond to the action category. An example would be *naguru* 'punch'.

(7)   Shinji ga   Taroo o   nagu-tte iru
       Shinji NOM   Taro ACC   punch-TE I.NPST
       'Shinji is punching Taroo.'

Shirai (2000:350) thusly relates Kudos (1995:72) framework to Vendlerian aspect categories.

I   *doosa*   Activity/Semelfactive
     'action'

II   *shutai doosa, kyakutai henka*   Accomplishment
     'subject's action, object's change'

III *shutai henka*   Achievement
     'subject's change'

(8)   Naomi wa   denki o   keshi-te iru.
      Naomi TOP   light ACC   turn off-TE I.NPST
      a. 'Naomi has turned the light off.'
      b. 'Naomi is turning off the lights.'
      c. 'Naomi has the light turned off.'

For example (8), Shirai states that the most natural interpretation is a resultative one, showing a problem in Okuda's theory that a verb with *-te iru* describes the situation of the subject, since a resultative interpretation here would involve a change in the object rather than the subject. (Shirai:348) Kudo (1995) showed that for this type of construction, both a resultative and progressive interpretation can occur owing to its dual nature in having both an action, on the part of the subject, and a change, on the part of the object. But in understanding which interpretation occurs for sentence such as this, Shirai argues that Kudo's framework isn't satisfactory, and that duration plays a part in determining what interpretation this particular sentence obtains.

Indeed, between interpretations a. and b., the difference seems to be whether the verb is understood to refer to a durative action or an instantaneous one. The instantaneous, perfective action of flipping a single switch leads to a resultative interpretation, while the durative and imperfective action of "throwing a succession of switches," which is naturally understood to have a duration, would receive a progressive interpretation.

In fact, if the sentence is understood as resultative, with the perfective event associated with that, the sentence would be understood to be an achievement – a simple instantaneous event, rather than an accomplishment which describes a durative situation with a logical endpoint.

Furthermore, while the sentence would usually be interpreted as resultative, it in that case "also implies that Naomi keeps the light turned off on her own volition," as in interpretation c. What we find is that the "subject's action/involvement is still there as predicted by the syntactic approach," but that this does not conflict with the notion of durativity playing a part in determining

-te iru's meaning. It is thus construed that *-te iru* both describes the situation of the subject, and is reliant on the temporal aspectual properties of the verb used in the construction with respect to the meaning it obtains.

With regards to habitual interpretations, it is claimed that:

> the habitual sense of *-te iru* can be obtained with any of the verb classes if the verb + *-te iru* denotes a situation that occurs repeatedly on multiple occasions; it is incompatible with a gnomic situation. (Shirai 2000:345)

Perfect interpretations are discussed by Kudo (1995), amongst which compatibility with the *de* adverbial is added to the prior discussion. The below examples are reiterated from page 6.

(9) Kanojo wa kekkonshi-te iru.
     She TOP   marry-TE I.NPST
     'She is married.'

(10) Kanojo wa suisu no   kyookai de   kekkonshi-te iru.
     She TOP   Switzerland GEN   church LOC   marriage do-TE I.NPST
     'She (has) got married at a church in Switzerland.'

Example (9) receives a resultative interpretation, but (10) on the other hand receives a perfect interpretation (Kudo 1995:119). This is believed to be a result of resultative interpretations being incompatible with the locative *de*, since it then intrinsically refers to the past situation as well as the current state. Shirai (2000) presents the following generalization of perfect *-te iru*, encompassing the prior discussion.

> The perfect sense of *-te iru* is obtained with verbs of any inherent aspect class, although state verbs generally resist an experiential perfect interpretation. In the case of achievement verbs, it can be difficult to distinguish resultative from perfect. (Shirai 2000:345)

While the habitual interpretation is accounted for well, Shirai admits that perfect is not accounted for in a satisfactory manner, and states that "it may turn out not to be possible to make a principled distinction between perfect and resultative when *-te iru* is used with achievements."

14

2.3 Problems with *-te iru* being regarded as ambiguous

Nishiyama (2006:188-189) showed problems with the prior research in showing that the distinction made by Fujii (1966) was faulty, and that past and present time adverbial compatibility cannot be used as a test to determine the meaning that obtains.

While example (2) is a perfect sentence, it is compatible with *genzai*, such as when sentence (3) is appended, leading to an existential reading similar to "now, he has written a lot of novels..." in English. Similarly, in the example (4) below (Shirai 2006:190), the past time adverbial *senshuu* 'last week' is used in a sentence that will usually be interpreted as plain resultative.

(1) Ano hito wa   takusan no   shoosetsu o   kai-te iru.
     That person TOP   many GEN   novels ACC   write-TE I.NPST
     'That person has written a lot of novels.'

(2) Genzai,   ano hito wa   takusan no   shoosetsu o   kai-te iru.
     Now,   that person TOP   many GEN   novels ACC   write-TE I.NPST
     'That person has written a lot of novels now.'

(3) Tatoeba,   Kiseki,   Ki no kuni....
     For example,   Miracle,   Ki GEN country...
     'For example, Kiseki, Ki no kuni....'

(4) Firumu wa senshuu   genzoo ni   dashi-te iru.
     Film TOP   last week   development LOC   submit-TE I.NPST
     'I've taken the film to the store for development last week.'

These problems mean that the test proposed by Fujii (1966) is faulty, and that compatibility with past time adverbials and completed action events cannot be used to determine whether *-te iru* is perfect or if it has the so-called current situation interpretation.

He also takes issue with the claims put forth by Kudo (1995:119) with regards to usage with the *de* adverbial. While it is true, as Kudo claims, that the above sentence (5) is incompatible with perfect readings, and that the usage of g*enzai* in sentence (6) is considered odd as is correctly predicted, one can construct sentences which break this pattern, as seen in (7) (Shirai 2000:191).

(5) Kanojo wa suisu no   kyookai de   kekkonshi-te iru.
     She TOP   Switzerland GEN   church LOC   marry-TE I.NPST
     'She has gotten married at a church in Switzerland.'

15

(6) *Genzai   kanojo wa suisu no   kyookai de   kekkonshi-te iru.
     Now   she TOP   Switzerland GEN   church LOC   marriage do-TE I.NPST
     'She is married at church in Switzerland now.'

(7) Genzai   kanojo wa suisu de   kekkonshi-te iru.
     Now   she TOP   Switzerland LOC   marry-TE I.NPST
     'She has gotten married in Switzerland (and is still married there) now.'

Usage of locative *de* in this particular context is not odd, in spite of the sentence being resultative, as well as used with the present-time adverbial *genzai*. This is because in this case, "*suisu de* 'in Switzerland' can be interpreted as related to the entailed resultant state holding at present" unlike in (6), where "*de* only describes the location (or institution) where the wedding ceremony is held." (Nishiyama 2006:191).

Nishiyama (2006) also brings up a particularity of *-te iru* by which it is not possible to use in narrative contexts to refer to a sequence of past events.

(1) *Kinoo wa takusan no gakusei ga kurasu de shitsumonshi-te iru. Watashi wa minna ni wakaru you ni shinsetsu ni oshie-te iru. Tanakakun ga kenkyuu shitsu ni ki-te iru.

     'Yesterday a lot of students asked questions in class. I taught them kindly so that everyone could understand. Mr. Tanaka came to my office. (Nishiyama 2006:193)

Here, the intended message is that a sequence of events occured one after another, but usage of *-te iru* is not appropriate here. According to Nishiyama, "the oddity of the present perfect use of *-te iru* to describe a sequence of events as seen in [1] can be explained if present perfects express states introduced by the perfect that hold at present [...]. States holding at present are irrelevant to the description of a sequence of events." (Nishiyama 2006:194) The general argument thus appears to be that the sentence is incompatible with an implicit reference to the present, leading to the oddity.

2.4   A monosemous analysis

On this basis, *-te iru* appears to not be ambiguous, and thus Nishiyama (2006) presented a monosemous analysis of *-te iru* as two separate morphemes, the imperfective operator -te-, and the stativizer -i-.

Part of the motivation for dividing *-te iru* into these two morphemes is found in the usage of -te- in contexts outside of *-te iru*.

> The events of drinking the milk in the refrigerator and melting one dose of the medicine do not have to be interpreted as complete. The vagueness of sentences [1] and [2] shows that *-te-* can function as an imperfective operator when followed by other aspectual verbs as well. Other aspectual verbs which can follow a main verb+*-te-* include *shima-* ('complete, end, put away') (*-te-shima-* 'finish -ing'), *ok-* ('leave, put') (*-te-ok-* 'leave V'), *ik-/k-* ('go/come') (*-te-ik-/-te-ku-* 'is going/getting to'). (Nishiyama 2006:196)

(1)   Ikkai bun no   kusuri o   juusu ni   tokashi-te mita.
      1Cl dose GEN   medicine ACC   juice LOC   melt-TE see.PAST
      'I tried melting one dose of the medicine in some juice.'
      (But it didn't melt completely./And it melted completely.)

(2)   Reizooko no   gyuunyuu ga   non-de aru.
      Refrigerator GEN   milk NOM   drink-TE exist.NPST
      'The milk in the refrigerator has been drunk.'
      (Some of it is left./Nothing is left.)

If *-te-* is shown to be somewhat consistent in its use outside of *-te iru* as well as within it, that is indicative of it possessing a distinct function of its own, separate from *-te iru* as a whole. It is construed that *-te-* denotes imperfectivity.

The imperfective marker *-te-* takes an input eventuality, i.e. the verb and its arguments, and applies a "bounding operator", producing an output.

Nishiyama (2006) states that in order to explain the difference between perfect and current situation interpretations, "the single meaning of *-te iru* needs to provide two types of outputs, an incomplete event for progressive [...] readings and a complete event for perfect readings." This is achieved by analyzing the "part-whole relation between events." (Nishiyama 2006:194) The key determinant for the meaning that obtains is whether the output of -te- is a proper or non-proper subpart of the input eventuality.

What this means is that when the output is the same as the input, that is, a non-proper subpart, the whole event will be regarded as completed and thus receive a perfect interpretation. On the other hand, when the output is a non-proper subpart of the input, the event will be interpreted as a non-completed event and thus progressive.

The following visualization exemplifies this. The brackets denote the duration of the output eventuality, and the lines mark the input eventuality in relation to it. As can be seen in example (1), with a perfect sentence, the input is regarded as the whole process of building these houses, and since the output is equal to the whole event in duration, the event is considered completed and

therefore perfect. In example (2), the output is not equal to the whole event in duration and the final part of the input eventuality is not a part of it, leading to an interpretation where the event is still progressing. In the case of (3), *shinu* 'die' is as a result of its punctual change-of-state nature not possible to divide into smaller parts, resulting in the event being regarded as completed.

(1) [-----------]
    Ichiroo ga   jukken   mo   ie o   tate-te iru.
    Ichiro NOM   ten   as many as house ACC   build-TE I.NPST
    'Ichiro has built ten houses.'

(2) [------]-----
    Ichiroo wa hashi-tte iru.
    Ichiro TOP run-TE I.NPST
    'Ichirou is running.'

(3) [-]
    Ichiroo wa shin-de iru.
    Ichiro TOP die-TE I.NPST
    'Ichirou is dead.'

Example (4) is only felicitous if the navel is visible at utterance time, in contrast with (5), which can be interpreted as a generic state (examples from Nishiyama 2006:198). That *-te iru* is not compatible with generic states in this sense further exemplifies that the output of -te- must be bounded and telic, even if the input eventuality is not.

(4) Sono jiinzu wa   oheso ga   mie-te iru.
    That jeans TOP navel NOM   visible-TE I.NPST
    '(Your) navel is visible with that pair of jeans.'

(5) Sono jiinzu wa   oheso ga   mieru.
    That jeans TOP navel NOM   visible NPST
    'The navel is visible with that pair of jeans.'

The function of the stativizer -i- is to take "the event outputted by -te-[...], i.e. a subpart of -te-'s input eventuality, as its argument, and map it onto a state which overlaps with a reference time interval" (Nishiyama 2006:205). It is this overlapping with a reference time interval that crucially

distinguishes *te iru* from a past tense marker for instance for the purposes of narrative contexts as brought up in the previous chapter, since such uses do not necessitate or make sense within the context of such a reference time.

The output state is vague with regards to its duration relative to the output of -te-, as demonstrated by the difference between examples (6) and (7). In (6), the implication that Ken is absent is something that began some time after he caught a cold, while the weak properties of the fence in example (7) presumably began before the event in question occurred (Nishiyama 2006:206).

(6)   Ken wa   hidoi kaze o   hii-te iru.
      Ken TOP   bad   cold ACC   catch-TE I.NPST
      'Ken has caught a bad cold.' (He is absent today.)

(7)   Kono   hei wa   sankai   taore-te iru.
      This   fence TOP 3 times   fall-TE I.NPST
      'This fence has fallen three times.' (It is not strong)

Chapter 3
Discussion

3.1 Standard *-te iru*

I wrote in the introduction that it was my intention to illuminate on the perfect reading of *-te iru*. It should at this point hopefully be clear why this is my focus. Shirai (2000) stated outright that it may be that the difference cannot be accounted for owing to the gradual development of *-te iru*'s function, and Nishiyama (2006) rejected the notion of perfect readings being inherently different from any other reading.

In this chapter, I will discuss the properties of this perfect interpretation and the circumstances under which it obtains within the context of an interview performed with a native speaker, using mostly example sentences roughly corresponding to those in several of my sources or simply taken directly from them. The results achieved lead to a few observations that I believe will further the discussion on the subject.

Much of the research regarding perfect readings of *-te iru* was done to find out the contexts of when perfect readings of *-te iru* obtain. It was generally thought that any verb compatible with *-te iru* could have perfect readings as well. For instance, within Ogiharas (1998) framework, any of the verb categories he defined could have what he called experiential interpretations given compatibility with a past time adverbial or a completed action event, as proposed by Fujii (1966).

It can thus be assumed that any simple verb-*te iru* construction should be compatible with both perfect and current-situation interpretations. In other words, a sentence containing only a subject and a verb with *-te iru* should be compatible with both interpretations. However, my efforts to support this during my interview proved utterly futile.

For example (1), the natural interpretation is that the speaker's brother is writing a thesis. At the same time, the sentence ought to be compatible with a perfect interpretation where the action of writing the thesis is completed.

(1)   Watashi no oniichan wa   sotsugyooronbun o   kai-te iru yo.
        Me GEN   big brother TOP thesis ACC   write-TE I.NPST SFP
        'My big brother is writing a thesis.'
        *'My big brother has written a thesis.'

I gave my informant this sentence within a context where I made it obvious that the writing of the essay was a past event by appending a sentence containing the following reference to the writing of the essay.

(2) Umaku   dekita.
     Well   done.PAST
     'It was well done.'

This sentence clearly referred to the thesis having been written well, using the past-tense marker *-ta*. I also confirmed with my informant that this was how she interpreted the context. However, my informant was adamant that the sentence could not be interpreted in any such way, even within this context. She held firmly that it could only mean that the person is writing the thesis at utterance time, and that it would otherwise be faulty.

Attempting the same with the semelfactive *naguru* 'punch' and the change-of-state verb *shinu* 'die' gave the same result.

(3) Sensei o   nagu-tte iru.
     Teacher   punch-TE I.NPST
     'I am punching the teacher.'
     '*I have punched the teacher.'

(4) Shin-de iru   no ni.
     die-TE I.NPST   in spite of
     'In spite of being dead.'
     '*In spite of having died.'

The context provided for example (3) was that two people were having a leisurely conversation where it came up that one of the speakers had a sore hand, and the sentence in question was meant to explain why. My informant held that the sentence could only work in contexts where the speaker was punching the teacher at utterance time, imagining a scenario where the two speakers where on the phone while one of them was pinning the teacher to the ground and punching him while the conversation was proceeding.

The context for example sentence (4) was one where it was established that a person who had died had returned to life. The sentence was faulty in this context in the eyes of my informant.

However, that evidently does not mean that the verbs themselves are not compatible with perfect interpretations.

(5) Shinji wa gokai   mo   shin-de iru.
     Shinji TOP five times as much   as die-TE I.NPST
     'Shinji has died five times.'

21

This sentence was first rejected by my informant as faulty, seeing as how people cannot die more than once, but eventually she came to the conclusion that it was possible to think of a scenario in which the sentence would work, such as if one had died five times while playing a video game. However, she still maintained that without the addition of *gokai mo* 'as much as five times', this would not work.

The implication is that without additional context within the sentence itself, *-te iru* cannot be interpreted as perfect, and will otherwise revert to a simple current situation interpretation. Context provided outside of the sentence appears to be inadequate to cause a perfect interpretation. To the best of my knowledge, this has not been pointed out in any of the earlier research. I interpret it as indicative that current situation interpretations of *-te iru* are the standard interpretations of the construction, with perfect interpretations being regarded as exceptions.[1] The fact that my informant at first rejected sentence (5) as faulty further supports this notion, since she had made the assumption that the sentence was meant to refer to a current situation, although this could also be indicative of the rarity of such a construction and thus be a result of unfamiliarity.

That *-te iru* has the current situation interpretation as a standard interpretation is in stark contrast to the notion of *-te iru* being utterly unambiguous between the two readings, as Nishiyama (2006) claims, since it presupposes a fundamental difference between them. At the same time, it remains unclear what this difference is and under what contexts perfect readings obtain, beyond that it must in some way be specified within the sentence itself.

Also, while simple sentences with no additional context to indicate perfect interpretation appear to be unambiguous, this is not the case with sentences that do have this context.

(6) Shinji wa jukken   mo   ie o   tate-te iru.
     Shinji TOP ten   as many as house ACC   build-TE I.NPST
     'Shinji has built ten houses/Shinji is building ten houses.'

The above sentence, taken from Ogihara (1998), is ambiguous between perfect and progressive interpretation. It could in other words mean both, and out of sentence contexts can thus alter its meaning. As such, it is shown that while in-sentence context is required for perfect interpretation, it will not necessarily – if at all – automatically make the sentence perfect. It merely creates the ambiguity, and forces the reader to consider the out-of-sentence context to ascertain the meaning of the sentence.

---

1   This could be explained by a gradual grammaticization of -te iru, as suggested by Shirai (2000).

3.2   Referencing the present

I f *-te iru* has the current situation interpretation as its standard interpretation and is incompatible with perfect readings without context given within the sentence proper, that is indicative of a fundamental difference between perfect and current situation readings. If we assume this to be true, the task then becomes to investigate what the difference is and why it occurs.

It has been proposed to consider the perfect interpretation experiential. Later research moved to the perfect branding, in part because Japanese already has an experiential marker, *-ta koto ga aru* (see chapter 2.2). Shirai stated the following regarding the difference between experiential *-ta koto ga aru* and perfect *-te iru*.

> With *-te iru*, [1] can denote perfect of continuation in the sense that she has continued studying French up to the present, although it does not exclude the possibility that she studied it a long time ago, in which case emphasis is on her good command of French, or some other aspect of her studying French that is of current relevance, such as 'therefore, she will not have much problem learning Spanish'. In contrast, [2], with experiential *-ta koto ga aru*, cannot mean she is still learning French, and the emphasis is on the fact of her studying it sometime prior to the present time. (Shirai 2000:336)

(1)   Naomi wa   furansugo o   ninen   benkyooshi-te iru.
        Naomi TOP   French ACC   two years   study-TE I.NPST
        'Naomi has been studying/has studied French for two years.'

(2)   Naomi wa   furansugo o   ninen   benkyooshi-ta koto ga aru.
        Naomi TOP   French ACC   two years   study-ASP.NPST
        'Naomi (has) studied French for two years.'

In contrasting *-ta koto ga aru* with *-te iru*, it is thus apparent that while *-ta koto ga aru* and perfect *-te iru* both convey completed actions, *-ta koto ga aru* merely focuses on the past situation, while *-te iru* focuses on a current situation related to the past situation.

Once again returning to the below example (3), my informant claimed that this sentence is indeed ambiguous between the two readings. But she also stated that if the action of building the houses was completed, leading to a perfect interpretation, the sentence may still not be acceptable as a perfect sentence if the houses happen to have been knocked down since, as this could be considered to remove the present time relevance of the sentence. However, it might not necessarily

make the sentences odd if what the sentence refers to is something different, such as someone's proficiency with making houses, or something completely different, like the builder of the houses being tired of building houses.

(3) Shinji wa jukken   mo   ie o   tate-te iru.
     Shinji TOP ten   as many as house ACC   build-TE I.NPST
     'Shinji has built ten houses/Shinji is building ten houses.'

The crucial point of note here is the focus on the present that *-te iru* carries. A perfect *-te iru* sentence is malformed if there is no present situation it is applicable to, such as the houses still standing. In this way, perfect *-te iru* is similar to current situation interpretations of *-te iru* in that they both focus on the present.

The conclusion I draw here is that *-te iru* carries an implicit reference to the present. In any situation where a *-te iru* sentence is used it will be taken to refer to a current, ongoing situation. That *-te iru* requires present relevance is not a new concept, but the crucial point is the innate reference *-te iru* contains to the present, and how it can be used to explain the perfect interpretation.

3.3   Dual situations in perfect *-te iru* constructions

If we consider perfect interpretations of *-te iru* in this light, it becomes increasingly apparent that these interpretations do not actually refer to one situation. They in fact refer to two distinct situations that are related to each other in some manner.

Thus, in example (1), if we take it to refer to a past event, the situation actually states two things. First, it states that Shinji has built ten houses. Second, it states that something related to this holds at present, without stating explicitly what this is. If there is no present situation applicable, the sentence is odd.

(1) Shinji wa jukken   mo   ie o   tate-te iru.
     Shinji TOP ten   as much as house ACC   build-TE I.NPST
     'Shinji has built ten houses.'

Consequently, I make the assessment that *-te iru* takes on perfect meaning when it refers to two distinct but related situations. Elaborating on the specifics of this relation, it is clear that it differs significantly from the resultative sense of *-te iru*.

24

Example (2) can only be taken to mean one thing: that Shinji is dead. On the other hand, (3) can mean a lot of different things related to Shinji dying five times. One interpretation could be that Shinji is playing a video game, and died five times. The implied result of his dying five times in the game could be that since he only had five lives, he now has to restart. It could also be taken to mean that he is simply bad at the game. The crucial part is that it holds at present and is related to the past situation.

(2)   Shinji wa   shin-de iru.
        Shinij TOP die-TE I.NPST
        'Shinji is dead.'

(3)   Shinji wa   gokai   mo   shin-de iru.
        Shinji TOP five times   as much as die-TE I.NPST
        'Shinji has died five times.'

This is an example of direct versus indirect causation (Comrie 1989). Plain resultative sentences refer only to a present situation, where the present situation being the result of a past event is peripheral to the intended meaning. The current situation must in these cases be directly caused by the past event. In contrast, perfect sentences have two separate situations that are indirectly related to each other.

This points to another reason for regarding perfect sentences as distinct, which is the indirect causative relation between the past event and the current situation.

3.4   Past time adverbials and locatives in *-te iru*

When considering *-te iru* on this basis, the reason why Fujii (1966) could state that *-te iru* took on perfect interpretation when used with a past time adverbial or completed action event becomes fairly clear. When *-te iru* is used with a word that indicates a completed, past event, it is a logical consequence that the sentence refers to a past situation. If *-te iru* is a present marker, using *-te iru* would indicate a present situation regardless of the adverbials used, which would result in a past time adverbial or completed action event within the sentence forcefully ejecting the situation referred to by the verb from the current situation referred to by *-te iru*. The resultant vacuum in the meaning *-te iru* refers to is then filled with an implication of a current situation that is a logical consequence of the past one.

Now, Nishiyama (2006:190) did present criticism of this test of *-te iru*. Take once again the following sentence.

(1) Firumu wa senshuu   genzoo ni   dashi-te iru.

Film TOP   last week   development LOC   submit-TE I.NPST

'I've taken the film to the store for development last week.'

This sentence is interpreted as resultative. Given the refinements I propose, I would argue that this is because the past time adverbial *senshuu* 'last week' refers not to a separate event, but rather extends the situation holding at present to a time in the past.

I make this assessment in part because of the following alteration to the sentence proposed informally by a teacher of Japanese (a native speaker).

(2) Firumu wa senshuu   kara genzoo ni   dashi-te iru

Film TOP   last week   since development LOC   submit-TE I.NPST

'I've had the film in development since last week'

I draw the conclusion that the native speaker in question intuitively knew that the intended meaning was resultative, and that the usage of the past time adverbial was to mark when the current situation began rather than a separate situation. As a result, she proposed using the word *kara* 'since' to indicate that the present situation began at a point in the past. I confirmed this suspicion with my formal informant as well.

Thus, the sentence takes on a resultative sense as a result of referring to only one situation. This also explains the apparent ambiguity with regards to usage with the *de* adverbial.

(3) Kanojo wa suisu de   kekkonshi-te iru.
She TOP   Switzerland LOC   marry-TE I.NPST
'She is married in Switzerland.'

(4) Kanojo wa suisu no   kyookai de   kekkonshi-te iru.
She TOP   Switzerland GEN   church LOC   marry-TE I.NPST
'She (has) got married at a church in Switzerland.'

While Kudo (1995) argued that usage with the *de* adverbial was only possible with perfect interpretations of *-te iru*, Nishiyama (2006) proved this to be untrue. However, I claim that the difference between the two above sentences is found in the event that the locative *de* refers to. *Suisu de* 'in Switzerland' can be interpreted as referring to the location of the present situation. However, *kyookai de* 'in a church', will very rarely be interpreted as referring to the place where the situation

holds at present, unless it is an ongoing action – that is, the wedding is taking place at utterance time. It will instead refer to the past situation of the marriage taking place, creating the vacuum of *-te iru*'s present meaning that must be filled with an implied current situation.

Another thing worth noting is that the fact that usage of *-te iru* is restricted in that it cannot be used for general statements, as noted in chapter 2.4, also fits with this explanation (Nishiyama 2006:198).

(5)　Sono jiinzu wa　oheso ga　　　　mie-te iru
　　　That　jeans TOP　navel NOM　　　visible-TE I.NPST
　　　'(Your) navel is visible with that pair of jeans'.

(6)　Sono jiinzu wa　oheso ga　　　　mieru
　　　That　jeans TOP　navel NOM　　　visible.NPST
　　　'The navel is visible with that pair of jeans.'

Here, the difference between *mieteiru* and *mieru* is the added focus on the present in the former that makes it incompatible with the general meaning the second sentence receives. In other words, the difference is the added focus on the present, which arguably further supports my view.

3.5　The role of in-sentence past contexts

If we move back to considering the standard and non-standard interpretations of *-te iru*, the reason in-sentence context is required for the perfect interpretation of *-te iru* should now become clear.

(1)　Shinji wa　jukken　　　mo　　　　ie o　　　　　　tate-te iru.
　　　Shinji TOP ten　　　　as many as house ACC　　　build-TE I.NPST
　　　'Shinji has built ten houses.'

Since *-te iru* has the function of marking a present situation, any simple sentence with *-te iru* will be understood to refer to a current situation. What happens in the above sentence (1) when it is interpreted as perfect is that *jukken mo* 'as much as ten' is taken to mean a past situation. As I said earlier, this forcefully ejects the meaning of the verb from the meaning of *-te iru*, leaving a vacuum in the meaning of the sentence that must be filled with a present situation.

If *jukken mo* is taken to refer to the ten houses Shinji is building now, then the vacuum never comes into existence, which leads to the sentence receiving a current situation interpretation.

27

In other words, there must within the sentence be something that can be interpreted as referring to a past event, but it must not be clear from the context within the sentence that it is a reference to a past event.

3.6   Past tense and the meaning of current situation interpretations

One thing that must be brought up at this point is that *-te iru* can be combined with the past tense marker *-ta*, which shifts the reference time to a point in the past. This does not appear to affect the interpretation of the construction in any way other than altering the "present" situation to one that was present and ongoing at a point in the past. Thus, it is possible to construct any given type of *-te iru* sentence given above and combine it with *-ta*, giving the exact same interpretation with the "present" reference time instead being shifted to the past.

(1)   Shinji wa   hashi-tte ita.
        Shinji TOP run-TE I.PAST
        'Shinji ran.'

(2)   Shinji wa   shin-de ita.
        Shinji TOP die-TE I.PAST
        'Shinji was dead.'

(3)   Shinji wa   Taroo o   nagu-tte ita.
        Shinji TOP Taro ACC   punch-TE I.PAST
        'Shinji was punching Taro.'

(4)   Shinji wa   mainichi   hashi-tte ita.
        Shinji TOP every day   run-TE I.PAST
        'Shinji was running on a daily basis.'

(5)   Shinji wa   jukken   mo   ie o   tate-te ita.
        Shinji TOP ten   as many as house-ACC   build-TE I.PAST
        'Shinji had built ten houses.'

For the above sentences, the added nuance of -te ita compared to a mere past tense *-ta* sentence is an added focus on the ongoing nature of the situation, in a way that appears consistent with normal use of *-te iru* but with a shifted time of reference.

It has generally been argued that *-te iru* is an imperfective and progressive marker, and that it adds a nuance of duration. It has also generally been understood to contain an innate reference to the present. I however argue that the primary meaning of *-te iru* is the innate reference to the present, with all else being a logical consequence of that, from the more readily apparent progressive and ongoing interpretation, to resultative where the focus is on an ongoing result state of a perfective event, to perfect where a past situation is referred to in a way that implies current relevance, all the way down to shifting the present reference time to a point in the past while still retaining the basic function of the marker.

When considering *-te iru* as a present marker, any situation holding at present must be durative in nature. This much is obvious. Thus, instantaneous changes of state such as death are intuitively understood when used with *-te iru* to refer not to a resultant state, which is compatible with the meaning of *-te iru*, but to a situation holding at present. The circumstances that lead to resultative contra progressive interpretation are of course more complicated than that, because there are verbs that can go both ways, although duration is always required for a progressive interpretation. The method advocated by Kudo (1995) and Shirai (2000) may provide the best account of the difference (recounted here in chapter 2.2).

Chapter 4
Conclusion

4.1   A proposal

On the basis of the previous discussion, I will here summarize my proposal for the analysis of *-te iru* and the meanings it can obtain.

First, *-te iru* is a present marker that denotes a situation holding at present. Thus, it will naturally be interpreted as either progressive or resultative depending on the aspectual qualities of the verb used if used as a simple sentence. In both cases, the sentence refers only to a current situation, i.e. even with resultative there is little regard to the past situation that resulted in the current situation. What is being referred to is only the current situation. Progressive interpretation takes on two forms, where one is progressive through continuation, and one through iteration. A habitual interpretation can also occur if the sentence refers to repeated but distinct situations.

(1)   Shinji wa   shin-de iru.
       Shinij TOP die-TE I.NPST
       'Shinji is dead.'
       Resultative

(2)   Shinji ga   Taroo o   nagu-tte iru.
       Shinji NOM   Taro ACC   punch-TE I.NPST
       'Shinji is punching Taro.'
       Iterative progressive

(3)   Shinji ga   hashi-tte iru.
       Shinji NOM   run-TE I.NPST
       'Shinji is running.'
       Progressive

(4)   Shinji ga   mainichi   hashi-tte iru.
       Shinji NOM   every day   run-TE I.npst
       'Shinji runs every day.'
       Habitual

30

When a context is provided within the sentence that indicates that the situation referred to by the verb is a past and completed situation, the present marker *-te iru* is taken to refer to a present situation that has an indirect causative relation to the past situation referred to by the verb. If there is no applicable current situation and the situation being referred to is a past situation, the sentence is anomalous.

(5)   Shinji wa   jukken   mo   ie o   tate-te iru.
      Shinji TOP ten   as much as house ACC build-TE I.NPST
      'Shinji has built ten houses. (the houses are still standing)' ==> Perfect
      'Shinji is building ten houses.' ==> Progressive
      'Shinji has built ten houses (the houses have been torn down)' ==> potentially anomalous

4.2   Final remarks

This thesis has focused on the perfect interpretation of *-te iru*, since it has been regarded as a point of friction in earlier research. The implications of my findings for interpreting current situation interpretations of *-te iru* could stand to be researched further. It may be that earlier models require revision to account for it, or alternatively that my conclusions need to be revised. This could be done in the context of a larger thesis.

Another issue that could stand to be researched further is that of gradual grammaticization, as it carries great implications for *-te iru*, depending on how it has developed and continues to develop. Yet another example is dialectal differences.

This thesis has focused on the inherent present reference included in *-te iru*. That *-te iru* requires a present situation is not a new concept, but the implications of an inherent reference to the present included in the marker can be used to explain the perfect interpretation. What remains to be examined is *-te iru* in a larger context, taking this into account.

Finally, a broader examination of perfect taking into account international research on multiple languages could serve to further the understanding of *-te iru* significantly.

References

Comrie, Bernard. (1976). *Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Basil Blackwell.

Fujii, Tadashi. (1966). Dooshi+te iru no Imi (The meaning of Verb+te iru). *Kokugo Kenkyuushitsu* 5, Tokyo University. (reprinted in Kindaichi (1976)).

Kindaichi, Haruhiko. (1950). Kokugo Dooshi no Ichibunrui (The Classification of Japanese Verbs). *Gengo Kenkyuu* **15**. 48–63. (reprinted in Kindaichi (1976)).

Kindaichi, Haruhiko. (1976). *Nihongo Dooshi no Asupekuto* (Aspectual Properties of Japanese Verbs). Mugi Shoboo.

Kudo, Mayumi. (1995). *Asupekuto-Tensu Taikei to Tekusuto: Gendai Nihongo Jikan no Hyougen* (Aspect-Tense Systems and Text: Temporal Expressions in Modern Japanese). Hitsuji Shoboo.

Matsushita, Daizaburo. (1924). *Hyoojyun nihon bunpoo* (The standard grammar of Japanese). Kigensha.

Nishiyama, Atsuko. (2006). The Meaning and Interpretations of the Japanese Aspect Marker -te i-. *Journal of Semantics,* **23** (2). 185-216.

Ogihara, Toshiyuki. (1998). The Ambiguity of the te form in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics,* **7** (2). 87-120.

Okuda, Yasuo. (1978a). Asupekuto no kenkyuu o megutte [zyoo] (On the study of aspect [l]). *Kyooiku Kokugo,* **53**. 33-44. (reprinted in: Okuda (1984)).

Okuda, Yasuo. (1978b). Asupekuto no kenkyuu o megutte [ge] (On the study of aspect [II]). *Kyooiku Kokugo* **54**. 14-27. (reprinted in: Okuda (1984)).

Okuda, Yasuo. (1984). *Kotoba no Kenkyuu Josetsu* (An introduction to the study of language). Mugi Shoboo.

Shirai, Yasuhiro. (2000). The semantics of the Japanese imperfective -teiru: An integrative approach. *Journal of Pragmatics,* **32.** 327-361.

Smith, Carlota S. (1997). *The parameter of aspect*. Second edition. Kluwer.

Soga, Matsuo. (1983). *Tense and Aspect in Modern Colloquial Japanese*. University of British Columbia Press.

Vendler, Zeno. (1957). Verbs and Times. *The Philosophical Review,* **66** (2). 143-160.

Yoshikawa, Taketoki. (1976). Gendai nihongo dooshi no asupekuto no kenkyuu (The research on verbal aspect in modern Japanese). (in: Kindaichi (1976)).