DERIVING THE READINGS OF FRENCH *ETRE EN TRAIN DE* ·

BRIDGET COPLEY and ISABELLE ROY
CNRS – Université Paris 8
UMR 7023 Structures Formelles du Langage

French *être en train de* (*êetd,* lit. 'be.INF in the midst of'), generally considered to be the French progressive, has a reading in which the speaker expresses a negative attitude toward the described event. However, not all readings have this expressive meaning. Curiously, the "neutral" reading is not always felicitous. We consider and reject possible analyses in which the expressive meaning arises due to Gricean inference or due to there being two lexical entries for *êetd*. We propose that, like ordinary progressives (Portner, 1998), *êetd* has a modal at-issue meaning with a circumstantial modal base and a stereotypical ordering source. In addition, we argue, it has a modal conventional implicature with either a stereotypical or a bouletic ordering source. In this way we account for the behavior of *êetd*, and raise certain questions as to how conventional implicatures might be related to grammaticalization of aspect.

1. Introduction

The French simple present has both a generic/habitual reading and an ongoing reading. Hence, a sentence like (1) is ambiguous between a reading where that person normally or habitually eats bread and a reading where he is eating bread at present.

(1)   Il mange du   pain.
       he eats   of.the bread
       a.   'He eats bread.'   [generic/habitual]
       b.   'He is eating bread.'   [ongoing]

French also has another construction that expresses ongoing meaning, namely *être en train de* (henceforth, *êetd*), lit. 'be in the midst of'. This construction is traditionally referred to as the French progressive.

(2)   Il est en train de manger du   pain.
       he is in midst of eat.INF   of.the bread

'He is eating bread.'

So, like many languages, French has two ways to express ongoing meaning, via the simple present and the progressive form. However, as has been noted (Franckel 1989, Lachaux 2005, Martin, 2006, Do-Hurinville 2007, Patard & De Wit, 2011), French *êetd* differs from "ordinary" progressives (for instance, English *be -ing* or Spanish *estar -ndo*) in two notable ways. First of all, French *êetd* cannot express ongoing meaning in certain contexts where "ordinary" progressives are fine: compare (3)-(4), in English and Spanish respectively, with (5). The normal way to express the ongoing falling of rain is the simple present in French as in (5b). The *êetd* sentence in (5a) is judged awkward or inappropriate by native speakers in a neutral, out-of-the-blue context (but we will see below that (5a) is sometimes possible in other contexts).

(3)   It's raining.

(4)   Está   lloviendo.
        estar.PRES.3S raining
        'It's raining.'

(5)   a.   # Il est en train   de pleuvoir.
                   it is   in midst of rain.INF
                   'It's raining.'
        b.   Il pleut.
                it rains

Second, some instances of *êetd* seem to be associated with an additional expressive meaning, compared to the simple present: *êetd* sentences very often seem to convey information about the speaker's attitude toward the ongoing event. For instance, the question in (6b) is associated with an expressive meaning (glossed as 'the hell'), and seems to imply that the person is doing something that (s)he shouldn't be doing. A similar meaning of disapproval is found in examples (7b) and (8b).

(6)   a.   Qu'est-ce que tu   fais?
                what.is-it that you do
                'What are you doing?' / 'What do you do?'
        b.   Qu'est-ce que tu   es en train de faire?
                what.is-it that you are in midst of do.INF
                'What (the hell) are you doing?'

(7)   a.   Nous savons tous ce qui   se   passe   en Crimée.
                we   know   all that which REFL goes.on in Crimea

'We all know what's going on in Crimea.' / 'We all know what goes on in Crimea.'

b.   Nous savons tous ce   qui   est en train de se
     we   know   all   that which is   in midst of REFL
     passer   en Crimée.
     go.on.INF in Crimea
     'We all know what's going on in Crimea (and I disapprove).'

(8)   a.   Il prend un bonbon.
           he takes a   candy
           'He is taking a piece of candy.' / 'He takes a piece of candy.'

      b.   Il est en train de prendre un bonbon.
           he is in midst of take.INF a   candy
           'He is taking a piece of candy (and he shouldn't be).'

And, in fact, while we said that the *êetd* construction is not possible in a normal, neutral context with the verb *pleuvoir* 'rain' as in (5a), it becomes possible with an expressive meaning conveying, e.g. in (9) that we don't want rain on our picnic:

(9)   Il est en train de pleuvoir sur notre pique-nique.
      it is   in midst of rain.INF on our   picnic
      'It is raining on our picnic (and the picnic is ruined).'

Yet the expressive meaning does not always arise with *êetd* sentences. There are felicitous cases of *êetd* that do not seem to convey expressive meaning. For instance, *êetd* is commonly used to disambiguate between an ongoing and a habitual reading (10-11):

(10)   Quand je rêve   de moi, je cours. Je veux dire,   je suis en
       when   I dream of me, I run   I want say.INF I am   in
       train de courir.
       midst of run.INF
       'When I dream of myself, I {run/am running}. I mean, I am
        running.'

(11)   Chaque enfant est en train de décorer   son sapin de
       each   child   is in midst of decorate.INF his tree   of
       Noël.
       Christmas
       'Each child is decorating their own Christmas tree.' (and they are not done yet)

This article addresses the various readings associated with French *être en train de*. The issues to be explained are: (i) the content of the additional expressive meaning, (ii) the reason why the expressive meaning seems to not always arise, and (iii) the reason why the "neutral," non-expressive reading—i.e, the reading without the expressive meaning—is sometimes felicitous, as shown in (10) and (11), but is not always felicitous, as shown in (5a).

We consider and reject two analyses: one in which the additional meaning is derived via Gricean implicature, and another in which *êetd* is ambiguous between one lexical entry that has a conventional implicature to convey the expressive meaning, and another lexical entry that lacks it. We propose instead that *êetd* always has a conventional implicature. Following Portner's (1998) analysis of the English progressive, we treat the at-issue (ongoing) meaning of *êetd* as involving a modal with a stereotypical ordering source. We also treat the conventional implicature as involving a modal, but unlike the modal in the at-issue meaning, the modal in the conventional implicature can have a bouletic as well as a stereotypical ordering source. We derive the taxonomy of readings of *êetd* according to the ordering source of the conventional implicature and the interaction of the conventional implicature with the at-issue meaning.

2.   A conventional rather than a conversational implicature

One possible analysis of the contrast between *êetd* and the simple present is that of a Gricean implicature from the fact that the speaker chose the progressive over the simple present, to the conclusion that the speaker must be insisting on the ongoingness for some reason, namely that they disapprove. We see two issues with such an analysis.

First of all, a conversational implicature is cancellable. However, the expressive meaning associated with *êetd*, when it is present, is not cancellable. Any lexical material that indicates that the speaker has a positive attitude toward the proposition effectively contradicts the expressive meaning. If the expressive meaning is cancellable, adding such lexical material should be possible. However, we see in (12) and (13) that with material signaling a positive attitude toward the proposition, the only reading available is a negative one (ironic or suspicious); the speaker does not really have a positive attitude (contrary to (13a)).

(12)   Qu'est-ce que tu   es en train de nous faire pour le
        what.is-it that you are in midst of us   do.INF for the
        dîner? - On va se   régaler!
        dinner   we go REFL enjoy
        'What are you cooking for dinner? - We are going to love
        it!'   only negative/ironic

(13) a.   Qu'est-ce que tu fais de beau ?
              what-is-it that you do of nice
              'What are you doing that's nice?'
      b.   Qu'est-ce que t'es   en train de faire   de beau ?
              what-is-it that you-are in midst of do.INF of nice
              'What are you doing that's nice?'
                                  Franckel (1989); only negative/ironic

This fact indicates that the expressive meaning is not cancellable, therefore it is not contributed by a conversational implicature.

Secondly, if the expressive meaning of *êetd* really were contributed by a Gricean conversational implicature, we would expect such an implicature to arise quite generally in languages that have both a simple present and a progressive. But when we compare French and, e.g., Italian, it appears that for at least some speakers of Italian, the ongoing reading of (14a) and the only reading of (14b) are very similar if not identical in meaning:

(14) a.   Cosa fai?
              what do.2S
              'What are you doing?' / 'What do you do?'
      b.   Cosa stai   facendo?
              what stand.2S doing
              'What are you doing?'

And, moreover, in contrast to French, the use of (15b) does not require the speaker to have a negative stance toward what the interlocutor is doing; (15a) and (15b) are equivalent:

(15) a.   Cosa fai di bello ?
              what do of nice
              'What are you doing that's nice?'
      b.   Cosa stai   facendo di bello ?
              what stand doing   of nice
              'What are you doing that's nice?'

The *stare -ndo* construction in Italian thus does not contribute a negative expressive meaning. Such an expressive meaning seems, therefore, to be particular to the French *êetd* construction rather than a general Gricean conversational implicature provoked by the hearer's knowledge that the speaker could have chosen the simple present but didn't.

Rather than a conversational implicature, it seems we are dealing with a conventional implicature. We take our sense of what a conventional implicature is from Potts (2005), who builds on Grice (1975). Conventional

implicatures (henceforth "CIs") are part of the conventional meanings of words, they are independent of the at-issue meaning, and they are non-cancellable speaker commitments. The expressive meaning associated with *êetd* fulfills all these conditions: it is associated with a particular phrase (namely, *êetd),* it is independent of the at-issue meaning (e.g., the expressive meaning is not what's being questioned in (5b)); and as we have just shown, it is not cancellable.

3.   A first conventional implicature proposal for *êetd*

Taking on board the idea that a CI is the source of the expressive meaning associated with *êetd*, a first proposal might be that *êetd* is simply ambiguous between the expressive and "neutral" readings: one reading has the CI and one reading lacks it. The content of the expressive meaning on this account would be that the propositional complement of *êetd* is bad according to the speaker.

(16)   a. $\hat{e}etd_{\text{neutral}}$ at-issue meaning: p is ongoing
        b. $\hat{e}etd_{\text{expressive}}$ at-issue meaning: p is ongoing;
                                    CI: p is bad

This hypothesis treats the at-issue meaning of expressive *êetd* the same as the ongoing reading of the simple present, and correctly so; to see why, consider the question (17) and the responses in (18). A question with *êetd* can be felicitously answered using the simple present, as shown in (18a). In fact, as demonstrated in (18b), it *must* be answered using the simple present.

(17)   Qu'est-ce que tu   es en train de faire ?
        what.is-it that you are in midst of do.INF
        'What (the hell) are you doing?'

(18)   a.   Bah, je joue.
                uh   I   play
                'Uh, I'm playing.'
        b.   #Bah, je suis en train de jouer.
                uh   I   am in midst of play.INF
                'Uh, I'm playing.'

The fact that using *êetd* is odd in response to an *êetd* question also provides further support for our claim that there is a CI involved with *êetd,* in that it is odd for the speaker of (18b) to add their own CI in answer to the question.
        The hypothesis in (16) is thus *prima facie* plausible. However, it faces several problems related to ambiguity and the content of the CI. The first two problems concern the idea that *êetd* is lexically ambiguous. First, the reason for the proposed ambiguity is left unexplained. The assumption

that there are two lexical entries (whether accidentally homophonous or diachronically related) does not shed any particular light on why *êetd* should be ambiguous in this way. The second problem with the lexical ambiguity view is that the neutral reading of *êetd* is predicted to always be possible. The infelicity of, e.g., (5a) is completely unexpected if *êetd*$_{neutral}$ is available, since there is no particular reason to assume that *êetd*$_{neutral}$ should have a restricted distribution. So, the hypothesis in (16) presents two lexical items but does not explain their distribution.

The third issue regarding the hypothesis in (16) involves the content of the proposed CI of *êetd*$_{expressive}$. It is not always the case that the expressive meaning conveys that the speaker considers p to be bad. Cases such as (19) and (20) below illustrate this point.

(19)   Le général était en train de s'habiller.
        the general was in midst of REFL-dress.INF
        'The general was getting dressed.'
                    ⇒ the general wasn't "visible"

(20)   Je suis en train de me   brosser   les dents.
        I am in midst of REFL brush.INF the teeth
        'I am brushing my teeth.' (context: the phone rings)
                ⇒ I cannot pick up the phone

These cases make it clear that the speaker need not disapprove of p: (19) and (20) can be felicitously uttered even if, according to the speaker, it's not bad that the general is getting dressed, or that the speaker is brushing their teeth. These are, in fact, quite normal things to do. Rather, the intuition in these cases seems to be that some other proposition q is desired (the speaker seeing the general, the speaker picking up the phone), but it so happens that q is incompatible with p. Such a characterization would also account for the cases where p seems to be ~q, as in examples (6) - (9). This intuition will give us one of the tools we will need to understand the apparent variation in the contribution of the CI.

4. Proposal

With these cases in mind, we propose to understand the CI of *êetd* as making reference to an additional proposition q. We will use modal semantics, and the relationship between p (the propositional argument of the at-issue meaning, thus explicitly described by the lexical material in the sentence) and q (the propositional argument of the CI, not referred to by the lexical material in the sentence) to account for the various readings of *êetd*, including the neutral reading.

We argued above on the basis of the question-answer pair in (17) and (18a) that the at-issue meaning of *êetd* is the same as the ongoing reading of the simple present. We base our analysis of the at-issue meaning on Portner's (1998) modal proposal for the English progressive. We first assume an index c that collects contextual variables as in (21), including variables representing the speaker's conversational backgrounds in s_c, the situation of utterance.

(21) $c=\{x_c, s_c, f_c, g_c, b_c\}$
         x_c: speaker
         s_c: situation of utterance
         f_c: speaker's circumstantial conversational background in s_c
         g_c: speaker's stereotypical conversational background in s_c
         b_c: speaker's bouletic conversational background in s_c

The at-issue denotation of *êetd* is as in (22). The idea is that all the stereotypically-best circumstantially accessible worlds—those worlds accessible, given the circumstances, from the actual world, that most agree with stereotypical or lawlike behavior—are such that they contain a situation s', where s' is a supersituation of the topic situation s, such that p is true of s'.

(22) at-issue meaning of $[\![\hat{e}etd]\!]^c$ (stereotypical ordering source)
      $= \lambda p\, \lambda s\,.\, \forall w \in \mathrm{Best}(f_c, g_c) : \exists s'$ is part of w and s is a non-final part of s': $[p(s')]$

As for the CI, we know that the expressive meaning has something to do with the desire of the speaker. Adapting Heim's (1992) analysis of *want*, we treat the speaker's desire-worlds as being those which are, according to the speaker, accessible from the circumstances of the speech situation and most preferable. Thus, we use the speaker's circumstantial conversational background to form a modal base consisting of the accessible worlds, and we use the speaker's desires to form a "bouletic" (desire) ordering source, which picks out the accessible worlds that best satisfy the speaker's preferences. Using the same aspectual semantics as in (22), we get (23) as the bouletic CI:

(23) CI of $[\![\hat{e}etd]\!]^c$ (bouletic ordering source) =
      $\lambda q\, \lambda s\,.\, \forall w \in \mathrm{Best}(f_c, b_c) : \exists s'$ is part of w and s is a non-final part of s': $[q(s')]$

We retain the aspectual semantics of the at-issue meaning because in the CI the desired event would be begun or in progress at the speech situation and, if telic, would reach its conclusion after the speech situation. Note that the

CI in (23) has its own proposition q, with no particular relation to p, and that the value of q may be different from the value of p.

So we have the at-issue modal, in (22), with a circumstantial modal base and a stereotypical ordering source, and the modal CI, in (23), with a circumstantial modal base and a bouletic ordering source. Now, we know that if a modal has a circumstantial modal base, one and the same modal can often have *either* a bouletic or a stereotypical ordering source.

(24) I think that I will go to Harvard Square tomorrow…
   a. …I've been meaning to get some shopping done.
      [bouletic]
   b. . ..that's just the kind of thing I might do.
      [stereotypical]   Copley, 2002

We're not suggesting that the at-issue meaning of *êetd* given in (22) has another construal with a bouletic ordering source. However, we would like to suggest that the modal CI in (23) has both possibilities for its ordering source. So, in addition to (23) being a possible CI for *êetd*, we claim that the denotation in (25) is also available as a CI for *êetd*:

(25) CI of $[\![\hat{e}etd]\!]^c$ (stereotypical ordering source) =
   $\lambda q \, \lambda s \, . \, \forall w \in Best(f_c, g_c) : \exists s'$ is part of w and s is a non-final part of s': $[q(s')]$

Using these CIs, we now explain how they account for the various readings of *êetd*. We propose that *êetd* ALWAYS has a CI, including in the neutral case. In expressive readings, the CI has a bouletic ordering source as in (23); this is clear enough from the cases in (6) - (9) and (19) and (20). Neutral cases should obviously not have a bouletic ordering source in the CI; we will argue that they have the CI with the stereotypical ordering source, as in (25).

The choice of ordering source, however, is not the only difference between the expressive reading we have seen so far and the neutral reading we have seen so far: while the former requires that p be incompatible with q, the latter has no such requirement. Compare, for instance, (6)-(9) and (10)-(11). This difference raises the possibility of a taxonomy of readings based on two factors: the choice of ordering source in the CI, and the relationship between p (the proposition expressed by the complement of *êetd* and involved in the at-issue meaning) and q (the proposition introduced by the CI). *Êetd* does not impose any particular relationship between p and q, which means that the logical possibilities in such a taxonomy are as follows:

(26) a. bouletic ordering source in the CI (expressive reading)
     (i) $p \neq q$
     (ii) $p = q$

b.   stereotypical ordering source in the CI (neutral reading)
        (i) p = q
        (ii) p ≠ q

Note that only the choice of ordering source, strictly speaking, involves different *readings* per se; the relation between p and q is not represented in the semantics, so is strictly a matter of vagueness. We will call the four different logical possibilities "cases" for ease of discussion. Let us consider the four cases in turn.

5.   A taxonomy of *êetd*

5.1 Expressive cases: bouletic ordering source

5.1.1 Discordant case: bouletic ordering source, p ≠ q

The expressive readings we have seen so far, in (6)-(9), (19), and (20), fall into this case. Consider for instance (8b), repeated here as (27):

(27)   Il est en train de prendre un bonbon.   = (8b)
       he is in midst of take.INF a candy.
       'He is taking a piece of candy (and he shouldn't be).'

                                        (q = ¬p)

The at-issue meaning, according to (22), is that the current situation s is such that there is a supersituation s' of s, s a non-final part of s', such that on all circumstantially accessible worlds most compatible with the speaker's stereotypical knowledge, *he take a candy* is true of s'. The CI has a bouletic ordering source as in (23): the current situation s is such that there is a supersituation s' of s, s a non-final part of s', such that on all circumstantially accessible worlds most compatible with the speaker's desires, a proposition q is true of s'. What the speaker judges is that p is in the midst of happening, but the speaker would prefer that q be in the midst of happening.
    For example (27), q could be ¬p. However, as we have seen above for (19) and (20), q doesn't have to be ¬p. It could simply be incompatible with p, as in (20), repeated here as (28):

(28)   Je suis en train de me   brosser   les   dents.   = (20)
       I am in midst of REFL brush.INF the.PL teeth
       'I'm brushing my teeth (so I can't answer the phone).'

                                        (p ∩ q = 0)

And in fact, the requirement can be weakened further still: p need not even be incompatible with q. This can be seen from the fact that in (29), q is something like "the children are safe". In a subset of q worlds p holds, because some of the worlds in which the children are safe are worlds in which the children cross the street (safely).

(29) Attention! Les   enfants sont en train de traverser la   rue.
      Watch.out the.PL children are in midst of cross.INF the street
      'Watch out! The children are crossing the street (there is
      imminent danger).'   (p ⊂ q)

The choice of q is predicted to be highly sensitive to context, and indeed the speaker might intend a value for q that is different from what the hearer presumes. Nonetheless, these examples show that the logical possibility where p is not the same as q and the ordering source of the CI is bouletic is in fact attested, since it is not possible to paraphrase these examples using any other of the logical possibilities listed in (26).

5.1.2 Accordant case: bouletic ordering source, p = q

Another logical possibility is that there is a bouletic ordering source and p = q; we will call this the accordant case. The question is whether the accordant case is attested. We can certainly come up with examples where a q equal to p can be chosen. For example, we could understand the bouletic CI in (30) to convey that the speaker wants to be speaking.

(30) a.   Je parle.
            I talk
            'I'm talking.'
      b.   Je suis en train de parler.
            I am   in midst of talk.INF
            'I'm talking (and I want to be talking).'
                                                            (p = q)

Likewise, in (31), the bouletic CI could be that the speaker wants the interlocutor's sister to be sleeping.

(31) a.   Ta   soeur dort.
            your sister sleeps
            'Your sister is sleeping'.
      b.   Ta soeur   est en train   de dormir.
            your sister is   in midst of sleep.INF
            'Your sister is sleeping (and I want her to be
            sleeping).   (p = q)

However, in these examples it is possible to choose q differently and achieve more or less the same effect.[1] That is, in these examples, q could instead be some proposition that is conducive to p. So for instance, for (30) q could be the proposition that someone else is not speaking; for (31), q could be the proposition that the interlocutor does not disturb their sister or alternatively, simply that the interlocutor keeps quiet. Since this is the case, we cannot conclude that there is positive evidence for the accordant case; on the other hand, we see no evidence against it either.

5.2 Neutral cases: stereotypical ordering source

As we have said above, we propose that *êetd* always has a CI; in that sense, every instance of *êetd* is "expressive". However, the neutral examples don't have an expressive flavor because the meaning of the CI is not bouletic. We consider now the logical possibilities that have a stereotypical ordering source: first the case where p = q, and subsequently, the case where p ≠ q.

5.2.1 Disambiguating case: stereotypical ordering source, p = q

If the CI's ordering source is stereotypical and p = q, that means that the CI has exactly the same denotation as the at-issue meaning. This will allow us to make sense of the fact that it is odd to say (5a) out of the blue (repeated here as (32a); recall that it is also possible to say *il est en train de pleuvoir* in the discordant case, section 5.1.1), but that *êetd pleuvoir* is possible in other apparently non-expressive contexts, such as (32b). The question is how (32b) can be possible given that (32a) is impossible under a "neutral" interpretation.

(32) a.   #Il est en train de pleuvoir.
           it is   in midst of rain.INF
           'It's raining.'
      b.   Il doit être   en train de pleuvoir.
           it must be.INF in midst of rain.INF
           'It must be raining.'
                             (ongoing-epistemic / *future-deontic)
      c.   Il doit pleuvoir.
           it must rain.INF
           'It must be raining / rain.'
                             (ongoing-epistemic / future-deontic)

The example in (32b) is possible, we claim, exactly because the simple present version in (32c) is ambiguous. The reason for the ambiguity in this particular example is the modal *devoir*. Both an ongoing reading and a

---

[1] We thank an anonymous reviewer for bringing this point to our attention.

future-oriented reading are possible with the French simple present under modals. The ongoing reading is only compatible with an epistemic reading of *devoir* ('it must be true that...'), and the future-oriented reading is only compatible with a deontic reading ('someone requires that...'; Condoravdi, 2002, among many others). Thus, the simple present as in (32c) is ambiguous between an ongoing, epistemic reading: 'It must be true that it is raining' and a future-oriented, deontic reading: 'Someone requires that it rain.'

We propose that when the simple present cannot be disambiguated and the speaker wishes to express an ongoing reading, they can use *êetd*, using a stereotypical ordering source for its CI (which, recall, is the same as its at-issue meaning), to disambiguate. This possibility is not available for (32a), as in (32a), there is no need to disambiguate. Therefore the simple present, which lacks the CI but has the same at-issue meaning, is preferred on grounds of economy to *êetd*.

This disambiguation strategy is not limited to the complement of models, but is general to whenever the speaker needs to disambiguate an ongoing reading from another reading, as in (10) and (11), repeated below as (33) and (34):

> (33)　Quand je rêve de moi, je cours. Je veux dire,　　je suis en
> 　　　when I dream of me, I run　 I want say.INF   I am in
> 　　　train de courir.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　 (=(10))
> 　　　midst of run.INF
> 　　　'When I dream of myself, I {run/am running}. I mean, I am
> 　　　running.'　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(p = q)

> (34)　Chaque enfant est en train de décorer　　son sapin. (=(11))
> 　　　each　　child　is in midst of decorate.INF his tree
> 　　　'Each child is decorating their own Christmas tree.' (p = q)

5.2.2 Interpretive case: stereotypical ordering source, p ≠ q

We also predict that another neutral case exists, namely one in which there is a stereotypical ordering source for the CI but p and q are not equal. This agrees very well with a reading that has been noted in previous literature on *êetd* as well as other progressives (though in the latter we would not expect q to be "hard-coded" into the semantics as we propose for *êetd)*, namely the "interpretive" reading. The "interpretive" reading (Buyssens 1968, König 1980, Kearns 2003, Martin 2006, e.g.), as in (35), has been noted as presenting an alternative way of (re)describing a particular eventuality. As shown in (36), when an overt description of the event (*Mary left,* e.g.) is given first, it has a different relationship to the following progressive sentence when the progressive sentence is understood as interpretive (36c), compared to when it is not (36d).

(35)   You are making a mistake.
        = 'In doing what you are currently doing, you are making a
        mistake.'

(36)   a.   Mary left, making a mistake.
        b.   Mary left, smoking a cigarette.
        c.   By leaving, Mary is making a mistake.
        d.   #By leaving, Mary is smoking a cigarette.

Consider the sentences in (37). In our proposal, the propositional argument
p of the at-issue meaning of the second sentence, is the alternative
description of the event described by the first sentence. We propose that q,
the propositional argument of the CI contributed by *êetd,* is *Pierre leave the
meeting*. The CI of the second sentence thus echoes the description of the
event given in the first sentence. The *êetd* sentence then conveys that
something is going on—namely, that Pierre is making a mistake—while
effectively presupposing that something else is going on—namely, that
Pierre is leaving. Note that the simple present, though grammatical, does not
get an interpretive reading, as shown in (37b); it can only have an ongoing
reading if it does not have an interpretive reading, as shown in (37c).

(37)   a.   Pierre quitte la réunion. Il est en train de faire
                Pierre leaves the meeting he is in midst of make.INF
                une erreur.
                a mistake
                'Pierre is leaving the meeting. He is making a
                mistake.'   (p ≠ q)
        b.   #Pierre quitte la réunion. Il fait   une erreur.
                Pierre   leaves the meeting he makes a   mistake
                'Pierre is leaving the meeting. He is making a
                mistake.'
        c.   Pierre quitte la réunion. Il fume   une cigarette.
                Pierre leaves the meeting he smokes a   cigarette
                'Pierre is leaving the meeting. He is smoking a
                cigarette.'

The interpretive reading in (37) could be explained by using the bouletic
ordering source option for the CI of *êetd*, since the speaker presumably has
a negative attitude toward Pierre's mistake (=she wants Pierre to be doing
something else). However, it is possible to use positive-attitude lexical
material, as we did above in example (13), to test whether the negative
attitude is part of the meaning of the interpretive reading. If we do this, we

see that it is possible to have an interpretive reading with a non-ironic meaning, as in (38).

(38)   En faisant cette tournée, je suis en train de me   rendre
       in doing this tour   I am in midst of REFL render
       service moi-même.
       favor   myself
       'In doing this tour, I am doing myself a favor.'

This indicates that it is possible for CI not to have a bouletic ordering source, but rather a stereotypical ordering source, in a case where p is not the same as q.

   The speaker's stereotypical ordering source gives a sense of how the speaker thinks the course of events will proceed from the current situation. Since a single person in a single situation can't believe simultaneously that incompatible courses of events will happen, p and q are not allowed to be incompatible. (Note that this means that the possible relation between p and q is more restricted than with a bouletic ordering source.) However, p and q can still be non-identical.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion: we have proposed that there is only one *êetd*. The at-issue meaning of *êetd*, we have argued, is just an ongoing meaning, the same as the ongoing reading of the simple present. It has a modal conventional implicature with either a bouletic or a stereotypical ordering source. The following taxonomy of readings of *êetd* results:

(39)   Taxonomy of readings of *êetd*:
       a.   bouletic ordering source in the CI
             (i)   p ≠ q: 'discordant'
             (ii)   p = q: 'accordant'
       b.   stereotypical ordering source in the CI
             (i)   p = q: 'disambiguating'
             (ii)   p ≠ q: 'interpretive'

We presented evidence for all of these logically possible cases. Three of the four cases were attested; the existence of accordant case examples is difficult to prove, but we found no evidence to the contrary. This account entails that the CI is always there, but that when it has a stereotypical ordering source, it is not "expressive" in Potts' (2005) sense (good/bad). This makes it look as though the CI disappears. However, we know it is still there because *êetd* is not always felicitous in describing ongoing situations in out-of-the-blue contexts (e.g., example (5a), *#Il est en train de pleuvoir,*

'it is raining'). We proposed that this is because *êetd* has the exact same at-issue meaning as the ongoing reading of the simple present. The simple present should be preferred unless the CI is needed to disambiguate (stereotypical ordering source, p = q) or to convey that there is another description of an already-described event (stereotypical ordering source, p ≠ q).

This proposal raises a couple of intriguing questions as to the nature of CIs and of grammaticalization. If, as we have argued, *êetd* has a CI, it is an odd one according to Potts' (2005) theory, because (i) CI meaning is supposed to take at-issue meaning as an argument, and our CI does not, and (ii) any word is supposed to express either at-issue or CI meaning but not both; our *êetd* does both. The issue in (i) could be resolved by positing a two-dimensional Predicate Modification (see also Morzycki 2009). However, (ii) can't be resolved unless there are two heads involved in *êetd*. But since *êetd* isn't grammaticalized as a progressive, it may well be that it is comprised of two meaningful heads; likely *être* 'be.INF' would carry the at-issue aspectual meaning, as French verbs generally do, while *(en) train (de)* would carry the CI. Given this idea, we wonder whether there might not be a correlation, among aspectual morphology, between lack of grammaticalization and the presence of a CI. That is, we wonder whether there are other non-grammaticalized aspects that carry both at-issue meaning and CIs, and conversely, whether there are any grammaticalized aspects that do the same.

References

Buyssens, Eric, 1968, *Les deux aspectifs de la conjugaison anglaise au XX siècle*, Bruxelles: Presses universitaires de Bruxelles.

Condoravdi, C. 2002. Temporal interpretation of modals: Modals for the present and for the past. In Beaver, D., L. Casillas Martínez, B. Clark, S. Kaufmann (eds.), *The construction of meaning*, 59-88. CSLI: Stanford.

Do-Hurinville, Danh Thanh. 2007. "Etude Sémantique et Syntaxique de *Être en Train de*". *L'Information Grammaticale* 113: 32-39.

Heim, Irene. 1992. Presupposition Projection and the Semantics of Attitude Verbs. *Journal of Semantics* 9, 183-221.

Franckel, Jean-Jacques. 1989. *Etude de Quelques Marqueurs Aspectuels du Français*. Genève: Droz.

Kearns, Kate. 1991. The semantics of the English progressive. MIT Ph.D. thesis.

König, Ekkehard. 1980. On the context-dependence of the Progressive in English." In Christian Rohrer (ed.), *Time, Tense, and Quantifiers. Proceedings of the Stuttgart Conference on the Logic of Tense and Quantification*. 269-292. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Lachaux, F. 2005. La périphrase *être en train de*, perspective interlinguale (Anglais-Français): une modalisation de l'aspect. *Les périphrases verbales*. Bat-Zeev Shyldrot & Le Querler (eds). *Linguisticae Investigationes* 25. John Benjamins.

Martin, Fabienne. 2006. Progressive stative sentences in French. Talk presented at the Deuxième Atelier Franco-Allemand de Linguistique de l'École Doctorale Internationale Stuttgart/Paris 8.

Morzycki, Marcin. 2009. "Degree modification of gradable nouns: Size adjectives and adnominal degree morphemes." *Natural Language Semantics* 17(2): 175-203.

Patard, Adeline. and Astrid De Wit. 2011. "The Present Progressive in French in Comparison with English". In the Proceedings of CHRONOS 10 – 10th International Conference on Tense, Aspect, Modality and Evidentiality.

Portner, Paul. 1998. The progressive in modal semantics. *Language* 74: 760-787.

Potts, Chris. 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. OUP.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, and Ekkehard König. 1991. "The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited." *Approaches to grammaticalization* 1. 189-218.