
Time and Focus: The Case of German *gerade*

GERHARD SCHADEN

Université Paris 8, UMR 7023

gerhard.schaden@yahoo.fr

ABSTRACT. The article deals with the temporal readings of German focus particle *gerade*. First, it will be shown that there are two temporal readings, “immediate-anteriority” and “progressive” respectively, depending on the aspectual properties of the sentence. A scalar treatment of aspect in its interaction with *gerade* will be outlined. Second, *gerade* will be compared with *schon* (‘already’), a much better investigated focus particle. The question of the presuppositional structure will be discussed in order to account for some effects of *gerade*.

1 The Problem

As some other much better investigated focus particles – for instance German *schon* ‘already’ or *noch* ‘still’ – the German focus particle *gerade* displays temporal uses. In one of these temporal uses, *gerade* has been identified by Dahl (1985) as the German expression of the progressive, which seems very plausible considering examples like (1):

- (1) a. Otto isst gerade Schokolade. [= Präsens]¹
Otto eats GERADE chocolate.
‘Otto is eating chocolate (in this very moment).’
- b. Als das Feuer ausbrach setzte Otto gerade seinen Helm auf.
when the fire outbroke put Otto GERADE his helmet on.
[= Präteritum]
‘When the fire started, Otto was putting on his helmet.’

¹This article has greatly benefitted from the suggestions and comments of and the discussions with Nisrine Al-Zahre, Nora Boneh, Patricia Cabredo Hofherr, Ekkehard König, Brenda Laca, Laurent Roussarie, Benjamin Spector, Alice ter Meulen and three anonymous reviewers of ESSLLI. I’d also like to thank Jules Gouguet for correcting my English. For any error or omission, of course, I take entire responsibility. For the sake of better comprehension, I will indicate in square brackets the tense of the verb *gerade* applies to.

If *gerade* is omitted, (1a) might assert not an actual event of Otto eating chocolate at the time of utterance (TU), but an individual-level disposition or habit (he isn't disgusted by chocolate; he eats it). In (1b), the preferred reading obtained when *gerade* is omitted would be that Otto put on his helmet *after* the fire started and *because* the fire started (say, because he is a firefighter). However, (1b) without *gerade* could also have the (pragmatically strongly dispreferred) 'progressive' reading exemplified in the translation above. This is to say that the readings triggered by *gerade* are also available for the sentences not containing it: 'progressive' *gerade* merely disambiguates a sentence.

However, there is a second temporal use of *gerade* that rules out any straightforward identification with an English-style progressive: *gerade* is also commonly used to indicate the immediate anteriority of an event to some contextually given point of reference R:

- (2) a. Anna hat gerade einen Brief geschrieben. [= Perfekt]
 Anna has GERADE a letter written.
 'Anna has just written a letter.'
- b. Als Anna gerade alle Beweise beseitigt hatte, stürmte die Polizei ihre
 when Anna GERADE all proofs destroyed had, assaulted the police her
 Wohnung. [Plusquamperfekt]
 flat.
 'When Anna had just destroyed all proofs, the police took her flat by assault.'

In (2), the focus particle forces to situate the event described by the proposition with *gerade* immediately before R; in (2a), the writing of the letter might have taken place at any time in the past, and in (2b), Anna's destroying of the proofs might have similarly taken place at any time preceding the assault of the police in the absence of *gerade*.

The distributional pattern of *gerade* to some extent recalls the English focus particle *just*, which appeared in the glosses of (2), and which situates the event in the same way immediately before R (cf. (3a)). *Just* can also occur in a sentence with the progressive (cf. (3b)).

- (3) a. Anna? – I've just seen her in the hall.
 b. I'm just cleaning my room.

(3b) has a modal meaning; it doesn't state, as would the same sentence in German, the mere fact that at TU, the speaker is engaged in the activity of cleaning his/her room.² Contrary to what *gerade* does, *just* doesn't take away a possible interpretation, but adds a modal value instead.

²König (1991, pp. 121ff.) states furthermore that *just* belongs to the subclass of exclusive focus particles – that is, particles that discard any alternative focus value different from the one asserted – whereas *gerade* doesn't belong to this class. This is correct, I think, but it is quite tricky to show it by opposing them directly, as it seems that *just* and *gerade* don't apply (as non-temporal focus particles) to the same type of arguments. Note, however, that you can generally paraphrase *just* in its non-temporal uses by 'nothing but', which is impossible with *gerade*.

Nevertheless, (1-2) do not show what is just an idiosyncratic behaviour of German *gerade*, as Russian *kak raz* (‘wh- times’) seems to behave in a quite similar way³:

- (4) a. Ona kak raz dočitala knigu, kogda ...
 she kak raz read.completive book, when ...
 ‘She had just finished a/the book, when ...’
- b. Ona kak raz čitala knigu, kogda ...
 she kak raz read book, when ...
 ‘(By coincidence) she was reading a/the book, when ...’

2 The Role of Aspect

We have seen that the Präsens (1a) and the Präteritum (1b) trigger a progressive reading, whereas the Perfekt (2a) and the Plusquamperfekt (2b) trigger an immediate-anteriority reading with *gerade*.

To explain this, it will be enlightening to adopt a neo-Reichenbachian framework as Klein (1995)⁴. Therein, temporality is split in two domains: tense, which is the relation between TU and a topic time (TT; the time for which an assertion holds),- and aspect, which is the relation between TT and the time of the situation (T-Sit). I will assume with Smith (1991) that there is a sort of underspecified or ‘neutral’ aspect, whose interpretation is much less constrained than that of perfective or imperfective aspect.

For what will follow, I will assume that the temporal system of Standard German can be captured by the following schema:⁵

³Thanks to Ora Matushansky for pointing that out to me and for providing me with example (4).

⁴Readers familiar with neo-Reichenbachian analyses might be puzzled by the fact that I use at the same time the neo-Reichenbachian *TT* and its historic ‘ancestor’, the Reichenbachian *R*. In Reichenbach (1966), *R* performs two basic tasks: It is responsible for the temporal coherence of a discourse, and contributes to the temporal location of *E* (i.e., T-Sit). More recent analysis prefer to split those two tasks: Neo-Reichenbachian *TT* took over only the second one; and in Klein (1995 or 2000), there is nothing comparable to the first task of *R*. The Standard DRT’s (cf. Kamp and Reyle (1993)) conception of *R* on the contrary is the successor precisely of the first task of Reichenbach’s *R*, whereas the aspectual component is taken care of by other mechanisms. In this article, I will use ‘TT’ in the neo-Reichenbachian tradition, which means that it is (a) an interval and (b) given by the tensed verb (at least in German). ‘R’ is conceived of as it is in DRT: it represents (a) a point in time and (b) may be contextually given. As we will see later (cf. (6a) and (7)), we need such a contextually given point in time to describe the behaviour of *gerade* in an adequate way.

⁵This schema is an oversimplification in two respects. First, at least in the Southern dialects, where the Präteritum has been eliminated from spoken language by the Perfekt, the Perfekt is ambiguous between the reading indicated in (5), a retrospective present tense, and a neutral past tense, that is, it also expresses the value represented by the Präteritum in (5). Second, the representation of neutral viewpoint aspect by \sqsubseteq is merely meant to indicate underspecification; for a different formalization, cf. Pancheva (2003).

	Neutral TT \subseteq T-Sit	Retrospective TT $>$ T-Sit
(5) Present: TU \subseteq TT	Präsens	Perfekt
Past: TU $>$ TT	Präteritum	Plusquamperfekt
Future: TU $<$ TT	Futur	Futur Perfekt

We have already seen in (1–2) which effects *gerade* produces with the present and the past tenses. Let's now examine what happens with the future tenses:

- (6) a. Anna wird gerade Schokolade essen. [= Futur]
 Anna becomes GERADE chocolate eat.
 'Anna is probably eating chocolate.'
- b. Wenn wir (morgen) abfliegen, wird Otto gerade im Büro sitzen.
 when we (tomorrow) off-fly, becomes Otto GERADE in-the office sit.
 [= Futur]
 '(Tomorrow) When we fly away, Otto will be sitting in his office.'
- c. Wenn wir (morgen) abfliegen, wird Otto gerade gefrühstückt haben.
 when we (tomorrow) off-fly, becomes Otto GERADE breakfast-ed have.
 [= Futur Perfekt]
 'When we fly away (tomorrow), Otto will just have had his breakfast.'

(6a) shows that – if there is no contextually given R – the Futur with *gerade* is interpreted as an epistemic modal present, probably because R is equated to TU by default. If there is a contextually given R, the effects are exactly the same as in the past tenses. From this, we may conclude that *gerade* is interpreted as a progressive when applied to an aspectually neutral tense, and as an expression of immediate anteriority when applied to a retrospective tense⁶.

There are, however, some differences between past and future tenses: whereas (6a) gives an epistemic modal present, its past tense equivalent is simply odd out of context: it lacks an accessible R to relate to (cf. (7)):

- (7) ??Anna aß gerade Schokolade. [= Präteritum]
 Anna ate GERADE chocolate.
 'Anna was eating chocolate.'

Note that this is the same sort of strangeness one associates with 'out of the blue' imparfait sentences in Romance or past progressive sentences in English which lack an

⁶Two things do not fit neatly into this picture: one can get an immediate anteriority reading with the Präterita of *sein* (to be), and also with *haben* (to have) *at X place* (eg., *in my hand*). This is probably correlated to the fact that for some reason, the Präteritum forms of those verbs are strongly preferred to their corresponding Perfekt forms, even in the Southern dialects (where these verbs constitute the last remnants of the Präteritum).

‘anchoring’ temporal adverbial or temporal clause.⁷

Let’s take one step back. We have seen that *gerade* eliminates all but one of the possible readings with both retrospective and neutral aspect. On a purely descriptive level, we can say that *gerade* in its immediate anteriority reading assures that we get something like ‘contiguity’ between TT and T-Sit (cf. (8b)) when combined with retrospective aspect, instead of having the ‘normal’ retrospective semantics (cf. (8a)):

- (8) a. $\lambda P \exists e [P(e) \wedge \tau(e) < TT]$
 b. $\lambda P \exists e [P(e) \wedge \tau(e) < TT \wedge \exists I, I', I'' [I' \sqsubset TT \wedge I' \sqsubset I \wedge I'' \sqsubset \tau(e) \wedge I'' \sqsubset I \wedge I' \oplus I'' = I]]$ ⁸

Based on Smith (1991), we can formalize in the same way neutral (which I take to be underspecified, cf. (9a)) and progressive viewpoint aspect (cf. (9b)):

- (9) a. $\lambda P \exists e, t_i, t_j [P(e) \wedge t_i = I(e) \wedge t_j = F(e) \wedge \forall t [t \in TT \rightarrow t \geq t_i \wedge t \leq t_j]]$ ⁹
 b. $\lambda P \exists e, t_i, t_j [P(e) \wedge t_i = I(e) \wedge t_j = F(e) \wedge \forall t [t \in TT \rightarrow t > t_i \wedge t < t_j]]$

What is quite particular about those formalizations¹⁰ is that (8b) entails, but is not entailed by, (8a). Thus, (8b) asymmetrically entails (8a). The same relation holds between (9b) and (9a). We can put it the other way round: (9b) and (8b) are more specific forms of (9a) and (8a).

Now, such relations of asymmetrical entailment are used in neo-Gricean pragmatics to establish what is called “Horn-scales”, in order to explain the phenomenon of scalar implicatures¹¹. Take the positive general quantifiers, for instance. They form a scale:

⁷One of the reviewers suggested that *gerade* simply might ensure that TT was included in T-Sit in case of neutral aspect, and that in case of retrospective aspect, *gerade* operates on the “result state” of the event encoded, such that TT is included in the result state. I understood this as a proposal to analyze *gerade* as an operator on viewpoint aspect, which would be concise and elegant. However, I don’t think that we should adopt such an approach.

If *gerade* were an aspectual (viewpoint) operator, I don’t see how one could deal with sentences like the following, without any inflected verb (and therefore possibly without any functional categories of time it could operate on):

- (1) Gerade noch in seiner Werkstatt, jetzt auf unserer Showbühne!
 GERADE still in his workshop, now on our show-stage!
 ‘One moment ago still in his workshop, and now on our stage!’

(Showmaster Rudi Carell announced in this way the apparition on stage of candidates that were introduced first at their working place before they performed live on stage.)

Furthermore, one doesn’t really see how this analysis of *gerade* as an aspectual operator could be linked with its being a focus particle, that is: with the fact that such particles order the alternative focus values in a certain manner, as Krifka (2000) asserts.

⁸ $\tau(e)$ is the temporal trace of the event e . Put this way, (8b) only works if we assume discrete time. The second part of the formula makes sure that $\tau(e)$ and TT are contiguous.

⁹ t_i is the beginning of the event, and t_j is the end of the event.

¹⁰It is true that if one takes the formalization of Pancheva (2003), this implications do not hold. But it can be shown for independent reasons that Pancheva’s formula of the neutral aspect is not adequate, at least for German.

¹¹Cf. Chierchia (2002) for a discussion and the explanation of the reasoning involved.

(10) some < many < most < all.

All asymmetrically entails *most* and the other quantifiers. So, *all* is more informative than *most*, *many*, or *some*. The (strongly abbreviated) pragmatic reasoning is the following: if I hear somebody say *some N*, when it would be pertinent for me to know *all N*, I conclude that *all N* doesn't hold.

Although the situation is not exactly the same for *gerade* and the aspects, there are good reasons why one might want to adopt such a scale based treatment of this focus particle. When focusing on adjectives or DPs, *gerade* quite clearly displays scalar uses (cf. (11)). So, one needs a way to treat scales *gerade* applies to (or creates?) anyhow.

(11) Otto ist nicht gerade verrückt, aber ...¹²
 Otto is NEG GERADE mad, but ...
 'Otto is not exactly mad, but ...'

Thus, we may say that *gerade* eliminates in its temporal uses the less informative reading associated to an aspect. This move gets us the (approximatively) correct truth conditions of *gerade* with both of the aspects of German. However, (8) will have to be integrated in a more general picture of (at least German) Perfekt semantics, as the two readings in (8) are not able to capture the three or four Perfect values generally assumed in the literature (cf. Alexiadou, Rathert, and von Stechow (2003)).

3 *Gerade vs. Schon*

Previous work by Löbner (1989, 1999) and Krifka (2000) on *schon* ('already') and its relatives has been able to clearly establish four major facts about those focus particles: first of all, like quantifiers, they are organized in duality groups: $\neg\textit{schon}\neg\phi$ ($\neg\textit{already}\neg\phi$) being equivalent to *noch* ϕ (still ϕ). Second, they have to be evaluated on (relevant) intervals, not on points in time. Third, they trigger presuppositions, and fourth, they display a monotonic mapping between times and focus values (that is, the focus value must be either steadily increasing or steadily decreasing with time¹³).

I will not take up the issue of the possible duals of *gerade*, but I will address the other three points, which are all more or less intertwined.

Let us consider the following sentences:

(12) a. Anna hat noch [drei]_{FOC} Bonbons in ihrer Tasche.
 Anna has still three candies in her pocket.
 'Anna has still got three candies in her pocket.'

¹²Those scalar interpretations with adjectives appear mostly under negation. It seems to me that this is due to the fact that, without negation, one would interpret *gerade* in (11) rather in a temporal way, even if the result is very odd.

¹³Or defined in a formal way, taken from Krifka (2000, p. 5): \leq_T and \leq_A are aligned with respect to $f : [T \rightarrow A]$ iff $\forall t, t' \in T \forall X, X' \in A [f(t) = X \wedge f(t') = X' \rightarrow [X <_A X' \rightarrow t <_T t']]$

- b. Anna hat schon [drei]_{FOC} Bonbons in ihrer Tasche.
 Anna has already three candies in her pocket.
 ‘Anna has already got three candies in her pocket.’
- c. Anna hat gerade [drei]_{FOC} Bonbons in ihrer Tasche¹⁴.
 Anna has GERADE three candies in her pocket.
 ‘Anna has got (in this moment) three candies in her pocket.’

Following the analysis of Löbner and Krifka with respect to *schon* and *noch*, one can say all sentences in (12) assert the same: at TU, there are three candies in Anna’s pocket. They differ, however, in their presuppositions: For (12a) to be true, there must have been at least one moment in the relevant interval where she had more than three candies. For (12b) to be true, she must have had less than three candies. If we set the relevant interval for evaluation from t_0 to t_4 , TU being t_4 , (12a) would need a development like (13a), and (12b) a development like in (13b):

- (13) a. $\langle t_0, 8 \rangle \langle t_1, 6 \rangle \langle t_2, 5 \rangle \langle t_3, 4 \rangle \langle t_4, 3 \rangle$
 b. $\langle t_0, 0 \rangle \langle t_1, 1 \rangle \langle t_2, 2 \rangle \langle t_3, 2 \rangle \langle t_4, 3 \rangle$
 c. $\langle t_0, 2 \rangle \langle t_1, 6 \rangle \langle t_2, 0 \rangle \langle t_3, 4 \rangle \langle t_4, 3 \rangle$

As one can easily check, (13a-b) display a monotonic mapping between times and the number of candies, whereas (13c) doesn’t. It is impossible to assert (12a or b) truthfully in a context like (13c), whereas (12c) can be truthfully uttered under (13a-c). This could be taken to mean that the truth conditions of a sentence with *gerade* depend only on the state of the world at a single moment.

But this is clearly not the case. Sentences like (14) are odd, although they describe truthfully the current reality (I assume):

- (14) a. ??/*Löwen haben gerade vier Pforten.
 lions have GERADE four paws.
 ‘Lions have got four paws (in this very moment).’
- b. *3 ist gerade eine Primzahl.
 3 is GERADE a prime-number.
 ‘3 is a prime number (in this very moment).’

Gerade is extremely bad with generic sentences or eternal truths. Some people (for instance, those believing in an extremely capricious omnipotent god) could be willing to accept (14a), but I do not see how one could save (14b).

Furthermore, *gerade* is very odd with non-reversible (resultant) states:

¹⁴In this sentence, as opposed to the other two, the focus with which the focus particle associates might also be *candies*. Nevertheless, in the following analysis, I will only consider the focus indicated by the brackets in (12c).

- (15) a. ??/*Der Apfel ist gerade gegessen.
 The apple is GERADE eaten.
 ‘The apple is eaten (for the moment).’
 b. ??/*Otto ist gerade tot.
 Otto is GERADE dead.
 ‘Otto is being dead (for the moment).’

If the apple is not self-regenerating, and if Otto isn’t someone who rises quite regularly from the death, sentences (15) are not acceptable.

So, we may want to add a presupposition to sentences with *gerade*, too, one that expresses that the circumstances described must be able to change¹⁵. According to Löbner (1989), for *already* ϕ (or *schon* ϕ) to be true at t_e , there must be an interval I preceding t_e where $\neg\phi$ is true. Consider (16):

- (16) Anne is already in New York (# and she never has left this city.).¹⁶

The presupposition of *noch* (‘still’) is – again according to Löbner – that for *noch* ϕ to be true at t_e , there must be an interval following t_e where ϕ doesn’t hold. Taking this description as a starting point, and in order to account for the similarity of *gerade* with the progressive, I propose the following formula as a description for the presupposition triggered by *gerade*:

- (17) GERADE(t, w, ϕ)
 presupposition: $\exists t_1, t_2 [t_1 < t \wedge \neg\phi(t_1, w) \wedge \exists w' \in W_{Inr}(t, w) [t < t_2 \wedge \neg\phi(t_2, w')]]$ ¹⁷

which means that *gerade* ϕ at t in w presupposes that there is a moment t_1 preceding t such that $\neg\phi$ is the case at t_1 . The second part states that there is at least one world w' which is a member of the set of inertia worlds of w up to t (that is, w and w' are identical up to t), such that $\neg\phi$ is the case at a moment t_2 posterior to at least t in this world w' .

(17) seems nice because we can derive it for free from two things we can quite safely assume: first of all, the fact that *gerade* is a non-exclusive focus particle, that is, it allows for alternative focus values. Secondly, that time is branching into the future. Given these two assumptions, and if we take *gerade* to associate points in time $t \neq t_e$ with alternative focus values a to form ordered sets of pairs $\langle t_0, a_0 \rangle \dots \langle t_n, a_n \rangle$, (17) would be what we would get. However, the only use of (17) is to get us rid of undesirable generic readings, as its adequation for the immediate-anteriority reading is trivial.

¹⁵It is very difficult to test if *gerade* triggers a presupposition in the standard, straightforward way. As there are multiple interferences of scope phenomena with negation or counterfactuals, any answer to what is happening in these constructions presupposes a working theory of *gerade*, precisely what we are trying to develop.

¹⁶A sentence like this would only be possible in the case of an inherited perspective. For a discussion, cf. Löbner (1989, p. 183).

¹⁷(17) draws heavily on the account of the English progressive given by Dowty (1979, p. 148ff). His original formula for the progressive is: $[PROG \phi]$ is true at $\langle I, w \rangle$ iff for some interval I' such that $I \subset I'$ and I is not a final subinterval for I' , and for all w' such that $w' \in Inr(\langle I, w \rangle)$, ϕ is true at $\langle I', w' \rangle$.

If we consider (17) and compare them with the presuppositions given by Löbner (1989) for *schon* and *noch*, we see that (17) is roughly the combination of the presuppositions of those two focus particles. One would expect therefore that, whenever either *noch* or *schon* fail to apply felicitously to a sentence because of presupposition failure, *gerade* isn't acceptable as well. This is indeed the case:

- (18) a. Otto ist schon/*noch/*gerade alt.
 Otto is already/*still/GERADE old.
 b. Anna ist *schon/noch/*gerade jung.
 Anna is *already/still/GERADE young.
 c. Otto ist schon/noch/gerade im Urlaub.
 Otto is already/still/GERADE on holiday.

As our knowledge of the world tells us that 'being old' is not followed by a phase of 'not being old', *noch* cannot apply to (18a), and neither can *gerade*. In (18b), *schon* is out because there is no phase of 'not being young' preceding 'being young', and *gerade* isn't felicitous either. In (18c) however, *schon* and *noch* are fine, and so is *gerade*.

A further point is that (17) doesn't exclude ϕ being a habit. In fact, *gerade* does not impose an interpretation as a single actual event:

- (19) Anna raucht gerade Smart.
 Anna smokes GERADE Smart.
 'Anna smokes Marlboro (for the moment).'

If Anna changes the brand she smokes from time to time, and for TU the brand she prefers is Smart, (19) is perfectly adequate, though she may not actually have a burning cigarette in her mouth in the moment (19) is uttered.

There are however examples that do not seem to be compatible with (17), as one of the reviewers pointed out:

- (20) Jedes Kind, das gerade in diesem Krankenhaus war, wurde mit dem Virus
 Every child, who GERADE in this hospital was, became with the virus
 infiziert.
 infected.
 'Every child that happened to be in this hospital was infected with the virus.'

(20) is in fact compatible with there being one or more children having been born in the hospital and having been infected with the virus. This, however, is excluded by (17). The reviewer suggests therefore to modalize the presupposition on both sides, or to reduce the presupposition to a conversational implicature.

Let's take a closer look at (20): if it lacked *gerade*, one would obtain at least one reading that is excluded by the focus particle: Being a child and having spent a period of time in that hospital would be the necessary and sufficient conditions to get infected with the virus. (20) as it is, however, needs a R in the preceding discourse for *gerade* to relate

to. Something like (21a) will not do, as it does not provide any event; one would need something like (21b) to obtain a coherent discourse.

- (21) a. J.F Scurf Hospital was notorious for its bad hygienic conditions.
 b. Last August, there was a power failure in J.F. Scurf Hospital.

This may lead us to reconsider the presupposition attributed to *gerade* on the base of sentences like (15). Indeed, English sentences (22) are odd in a quite similar way, although one would not be willing to say that *today* or *in this very moment* trigger a presupposition. One would rather go for a pragmatic explanation, saying that there is a conversational implicature.

- (22) a. ??King Arthur is dead today/in this very moment.
 b. ??3 is a prime number today/in this very moment.

Nevertheless, the effects on such non-reversible states don't seem to be exactly the same as the ones triggered by *gerade*, and abandoning the idea of a presupposition for a focus particle at this early stage would be a step with quite far-reaching consequences. It seems to be a safer option to modalize the presupposition on both sides of the assertion. Therefore the presupposition has to be restated as (23):

- (23) $\text{GERADE}(t,w,\phi)$
 presupposition: $\exists t_1, t_2, w' \in W_{Inr}(t, w)[t_1 < t \wedge t < t_2 \wedge \neg\phi(t_1, w') \wedge \neg\phi(t_2, w')]$
 where $\forall w'[w' \in W_{Inr}(t, w) \rightarrow \forall P\forall x[\|P(x)\|^{w',t} = \|P(x)\|^{w,t}]]$ ¹⁸

This weaker version of (17) doesn't allow for any inference on $\neg\phi$ in w at t_1 and is thus compatible with (20), without allowing at the same time for i-level predicates and unchangeable resultant states to occur. However, one cannot derive it as easily as (17) from general and generally accepted properties of time and focus.

4 Conclusion and Perspectives

In this article it has been shown that the distinction between progressive or immediate-anteriority readings depends crucially on the syntactic aspect of the verb the focus particle applies to. It has been argued that *gerade* triggers a presupposition, and a scalar treatment of aspect has been sketched which might prove applicable to other, non-temporal uses of *gerade*.

However, we are still far away from having an unified analysis of this focus particle, so that we see in the end, as Brecht:

[...] der Vorhang zu, und alle Fragen offen.¹⁹

¹⁸This defines inertia worlds before *and* after t , an inertia world of w at t being a world w' that is identical to w in any respect at t .

¹⁹[...] the curtain closed, and all questions open.

References

- Alexiadou, A., M. Rathert, and A. von Stechow (Eds.) (2003). *Perfect Explorations*, Berlin. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chierchia, G. (2002). Scalar implicatures, polarity phenomena, and the syntax/pragmatics interface. (ms.), University of Milan – Bicocca.
- Dahl, O. (1985). *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Blackwell.
- Dowty, D. R. (1979). *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar. The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and Montague's PTQ*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Kamp, H. and U. Reyle (1993). *From Discourse to Logic. Introduction to Modeltheoretic Semantics of Natural Language, Formal Logic and Discourse Representation Theory*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Klein, W. (1995). A time-relational analysis of Russian aspect. *Language* 71(4), 669–695.
- Klein, W. (2000). An analysis of the German Perfekt. *Language* 76(2), 358–382.
- König, E. (1991). *The Meaning of Focus Particles. A Comparative Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Krifka, M. (2000). Alternatives for aspectual particles: Semantics of *still* and *already*. (ms.), University of Texas at Austin.
- Löbner, S. (1989). German *schon – erst – noch*: An integrated analysis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12, 167–212.
- Löbner, S. (1999). Why German *schon* and *noch* are still duals: A reply to Van Der Auwera. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 22, 45–107.
- Pancheva, R. (2003). The aspectual makeup of Perfect participles and the interpretations of the Perfect. See Alexiadou, Rathert, and von Stechow (2003), pp. 277–306.
- Reichenbach, H. (1947/1966). *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. Toronto: Collier-MacMillan.
- Smith, C. S. (1991). *The Parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.