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Typological studies dedicated to PROGRESSIVE (e. g. Dahl (ed.) (2000: §4) and Vafaeian (2018)) have not yet provided extended analyses of accumulated data. The semantic map model has yet to be applied to the progressives.

Based on the data from 36 progressive markers in the languages of Europe (Bertinetto et al. (2000) *i. a.*) I’ve plotted a semantic map for PROGRESSIVE.

The map consists of 15 functions defined relative to sentences of the PROGQ questionnaire (Bertinetto et al. 2000). The set of functions is subdivided into three groups.

**Actional functions** (green) consist in changing the actional class of the verb. For example, Spanish Progressive used in this function freely co-occurs with the perfective Simple Past (1). If the former were semantically imperfective, this should have been impossible. Therefore, its function in such cases is only to reassign the verb to the atelic actional class $<$P, P$>$ (Tatevosov 2002).

(1) *estuvo* leyendo todo el día  
was:SP:3SG read:GER all the day  
‘S/he spent the whole day reading’. (Bertinetto et al. 2000: 535)

**Expressive functions** (lilac) consist in expressing (rather than describing) the speaker’s beliefs and feelings (Kroeger 2019: §2.6) with regards to the situation.
Aspectual functions (red or unmarked) imply inclusion of the Topic Time in the Time of Situation (Klein 1994) and do not imply expressive meaning.

It is desirable to provide a unifying semantics for PROGRESSIVE as a cross-linguistic category-type, from which the observable variation in language-particular progressives can be derived.

I assume that the progressives which only have the “agentive” function impose the following constraints on the predicate that they are applied to and on the situation described: (i) agentive subject; (ii) perceptual accessibility to the speaker; (iii) lack of truth-value relative to moments; (iv) temporariness; (v) restrictedness to one occasion (Cusic 1981). If a progressive has both the “agentive” and the “absentive” functions, this progressive requires that all these constraints except (ii) be obeyed. Etc.

This set of constraints is encapsulated in the notion of Proto-Process. The semantics for PROGRESSIVE can be formulated as inclusion of TT in the Time of a Situation corresponding to the Proto-Process. The core differences between progressives amount to different levels of strictness of the correspondence condition.

The notion of Proto-Process is diachronically relevant. Only the aspectual functions are derivable via this notion and — coincidentally — only these functions are retained in imperfectives. Thus, PROG imperfective drift (Bertinetto et al. 2000) can be modeled as an incremental weakening of the Proto-Process correspondence condition.

In the talk I will discuss in more detail the strengths and limitations of the current methodology.

Glosses: GER — gerund; 3SG — 3 person singular; SP — simple past.
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