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Definition of ASPECT in English Syntax: A Historical Survey

2. Several Definitions of Aspect in Structural Linguistics

Generally the approach by traditional grammarians can be logical or notional which leads to the disregard of the firm distinction between grammar and lexicon, while the treatment by structural linguists can be systematic based on the structural framework and statistics.

(1) Joos' analysis

Joos, in *The English Verb: Form and Meaning* (chap. 5, 1964), analyzes the relation among 'aspect,' 'tense,' and 'phase.' Showing the percentage through the investigation of the literature, Sybille Bedford's *The Trial of Dr. Adams*, he describes the characteristics of 'aspect' and the related problems. Joos divides aspects into two groups, 'generic aspect' and 'temporary aspect,' which can be illustrated as follows:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contemporary</th>
<th>Transformational Rules</th>
<th>Narrative in Actual Tense</th>
<th>Remote Tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERIC ASPECT**

Status verbs: all.
Process verbs:
  characterizing,
  demonstration,
  asservation.

**TEMPORARY ASPECT**

Process Verbs:
  temporary
  validity, background or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status verbs: all.</th>
<th>Process verbs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>characterizing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>etc.; <em>but also</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plot-advancing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analytical diagram is on the basis of the opposition of 'progressive form' to 'simple form' of verbs; the former is here called 'temporary aspect,' the latter is called 'generic aspect.'
According to Joos’ definition, on the other hand, a semantic category on ‘simple form’ and ‘perfect form’ is referred to as ‘phase;’ the former is ‘current phase,’ the latter is ‘perfect phase.’ Joos writes about the category ‘phase’ as follows:

This privative character of all the markers is curiously different in the case of the phase marker HAVE - N, as we shall see presently. But first the meaning of phrase has to be explored. It was given this untraditional name some fifteen years ago by George L. Trager and Henry Lee Smith, Jr., An Outline of English Structure. The name derives from the special relation between cause and effect signified by verbs in the perfect phase.

It should be noted that Joos thinks the categories expressed by ‘progressive form (be + -ing)’ and ‘perfect form (have + -en)’ belong to different molds, and that he only admits ‘progressive form’ as the category ‘aspect.’ It is interesting to find his deliberate distinction between ‘aspect’ and ‘phase,’ i.e., whether a given phrase is perfect or imperfect should be treated as another matter related to ‘phase.’

(2) Twaddell’s Analysis

We can obtain another valuable information from W. F. Twaddell’s The English Verb Auxiliaries (1963, 1968²), which consists of only twenty-six pages. We must remember that it is worth to read the thesis in spite of its brevity. Though we do not come across any obvious descriptions about the term ‘aspect’ in it, the treatments in sections such as “The Primary Auxiliaries,” “The Semantics of the Four Modifications,” and “Grammatical Characteristics of the Auxiliaries as a Class,” show us a unique way to recognize ‘progressive form’ and ‘perfect form,’ as follows:

3. 2. 2. The have + participle modification does not necessarily imply completed action expect to the extent that the earlier ‘action’ must have matured sufficiently to produce currently relevant effects. There need be no implication of completion in the sense of non-continuation of the suggesting some kind of completedness, previous termination, as essential semantic ingredients of Modification II, whereas these meanings are at most compatible by-products of the semantic combination of context, situation, the lexical verb, and the ‘Current relevance’ signal of have + participle.

3. 3. 0. Modification III, be + -ing, is sensitive to the semantics of the lexical verb. Its grammatical meaning, ‘Limited duration,’ is in a semantic dimension which is one of the coordinates of meaning of many lexical verbs, positively or negatively. Hence Modification III is versatile: its contribution varies according to the lexical verb’s ingredient of optional or compulsory duration or non-duration, repeatability or non-repeatability.

(1) Neutral with respect to duration or repetition.
(2) Durational, with possible limitation.
(3) Non-durational, with possible repetition.
(4) Non-durational, not subject to repetition in some contexts.
(5) Durational, not normally subject to repetition.

With the first four classes, be + -ing is the normal grammatical signal of simultaneity: limited duration par excellence. The chronological referent for simultaneity may be overtly contextual (adverbial, consecutive elements in a narrative) or situational. Without overt contextual or situational clues, be + -ing is a signal for limited duration simultaneous with the utterance itself — a semantic implication corresponding to ‘present tense.’

It is needless to say that Twaddell's approach is prudently designed on the basis of a syntactical framework; however, we can not help being given impression as Ota (1963) suggests, “Twaddell still seems to be largely intuitive or introspective in his approach.”

(3) Ota's analysis

Akira Ota seems to be the most distinguished scholar dealing with the problems on 'tense' and 'aspect' in Japan. We can select two volumes out of his tremendous works, which are Kanryō-kei・Shinkō-kei (Eibunpō Series, 12; 1954) and Tense and Aspect of Present-Day American English (1963). In the former volume 'progressive form' and 'perfect form' are investigated in the historical point of view of their development, i.e., the function of a grammatical form 'tense' is greatly emphasized here, while in the latter the semantics of 'simple form,' 'progressive form,' and 'perfect form' of verbs provides us with more information about 'aspect.'

In Chapter III, "Conclusion" of Tense and Aspect of Present-Day American English, Ota summarizes his grammatical point of view as follows: 7

There is first a dichotomy between the present (or non-past) tense and the past tense. Formally this is indicated by a morphological device, which separates not only simple present from simple past, but also present perfect from past perfect, present progressive from past progressive, and present perfect progressive from past perfect progressive. In the case of these phrasal structures, it is the first constituents that indicate present vs past. Semantically the distinction between present and past consists in whether the statement includes or contacts the present or is separated from it. This distinction is tense.

Perfect forms indicate the occurrence of an action or the existence of a state within or for a period of time stretching back into some earlier time. In the case of present perfect, one end of the period is the moment of speaking; in the case of past perfect, it is some time in the past (expressed or implied). Whether one end of the period is the moment of speaking or some time in the past belongs to tense. The essential semantic component of perfect forms as such is that it indicates a period of time stretching backward into some earlier time, and in this respect it is different from that of simple forms. It may be called secondary tense.
Progressive forms indicate, not the occurrence of an action or the existence of a state, but the process of an action. In the case of present progressive, this process is tied to now; in the case of past progressive, it is tied to some time in the past. Again whether the process is tied to now or some time in the past belongs to tense. The essential semantic component of progressive forms as such is "process." Since it is concerned with the mode of action, it may be called aspect. Simple forms as opposed to progressive forms grasp an action as a whole, as a static, complete fact or event.

"Completion," which is often said to be indicated by perfect, is the property of the lexical meaning of the verbs (that of conclusive verbs). "Continuation of an action up till now," which is also said to be indicated by the perfect form, is noticed when non-conclusive verbs are employed. Since these meanings are contingent upon the lexical meanings of the verbs used, they do not constitute the essential meanings of the perfect form.

Process implies duration, but duration is not the property of the progressive form alone, and therefore, is not its essential meaning. Continuation, incompleteness, temporariness, simultaneity, vividness of description, emotional coloring, and emphasis are overtones or "redundant features" deriving from the notion of process, but they sometimes reveal themselves rather conspicuously depending upon the context and the particular lexical meanings of the verbs employed.

The compact definitions of 'tense' and 'aspect' mentioned above will be quite helpful for us to discuss and theorize the notion of 'aspect' in the following chapter.

3. Definitions of Aspect in Generative – Transformational Grammar

In Syntactic Structures (1957), Noam Chomsky primitively analyzes AUX (= auxiliaries) by the use of PS Rule (= phrase structure rule) (28) as follows:⁸

\[
\text{AUX} \rightarrow \text{C (M)} (\text{have} + \text{en}) (\text{be} + \text{ing}) (\text{be} + \text{en}).
\]

C stands for the -s or the lack of it in the present tense, or -ed in the past tense; (M) stands for the modal auxiliary. We can, therefore, think C to be the term referring to 'tense' and subject agreement.

Concerning this analysis of AUX, there have emerged various arguments suggested by generative linguists. The definition of AUX advocated in Syntactic Structures has been claimed at three points. According to Susan Steele,⁹ the first claim is that a deep structure unit AUX is not proper for describing the characteristics of AUX in English, which is questioned by Jackendoff.¹⁰ On the basis of Jackendoff’s semantic analysis of a phrase structure rule introducing AUX, "the AUX includes only tense and modality; have and be are part of the VP."

\[
\text{AUX} \rightarrow \text{Tense (M)}.
\]
Chafe is one of those who think the AUX proposed in *Syntactic Structures* not to be appropriate one, and he does not think that tense, aspect, and modality are abstract higher predicates.\(^\text{11}\)

Akmajian and Wasow argue that the AUX should include all the elements of the original proposal by Chomsky, except for the passive (be + en).\(^\text{12}\)

\[
\text{AUX} \rightarrow \text{Tense (M) (have + en) (be + ing).}
\]

The second claim is about the problem on co-occurrence of the AUX and the main verb in the same clause, which is closely related to the first claim.

The third claim is that the unit AUX proposed by Chomsky involves various notional categories which should be separated into another category at another level. Thus it is necessary to modify the original model with the exclusion of the passive notion. Steele develops it as follows:\(^\text{13}\)

The AUX contains a certain notional set, a set containing tense, aspect, and modality elements. The traditional descriptions of auxiliary elements focused on the same notional set, although the elements contained therein are a larger class. This notional set involves elements which are sentential in scope, i.e., they place the situation described in the sentence in a certain time (tense), ascribe a temporal contour to it (aspect), and assess its reality (modality).

\[
\text{AUX} \rightarrow \text{Tense (M) Aspect.}
\]

The present writer has a favorable opinion of Steele’s analysis mentioned above, since he thinks that AUX system should basically represent ‘tense,’ ‘modality,’ and ‘aspect.’ Herein, ‘aspect’ should be thought to have a grammatical form like (have + en), (be + ing), or both of them. The structure of AUX with modification above, still further, can be illustrated as follows:

\[
\text{AUX} \rightarrow \text{Tense (M) (have + en) (be + ing).}
\]

Now we can show the deep structure of a sentence, “She has been singing a song,” for example.
Furthermore, the present writer should notify that we can obtain some valuable information from Harender N. Vasudeva, *Tense and Aspect in English* (1971), in which the transformational feature analysis of the categories develops; and from Frederick J. Newmeyer, *English Aspectual Verbs* (1975), in which we are led to a unique way of treatments of English verbs. Unfortunately we have no space to make introductory remarks on these volumes and discuss their approaches here.

4. Definitions of Aspect in Recent English Grammar, the London School

While there do not emerge so many firm and precise descriptions of ‘tense’ and ‘aspect’ in *A Grammar of Contemporary English* (1972) by Sir Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik, we find plenty of references to such categories in *A Communicative Grammar of English* (1975) by Leech and Svartvik. In addition to them, we can have more attentive information from Leech’s *Meaning and the English Verb* (1971). The strategy of treatment of ‘aspect’ in the last volume is concerned with setting grammatical forms in relation to a set of meanings, which is divided into two parts, i.e., one leads to meanings from forms, the other leads to forms from meanings. Leech thinks “it convenient to adopt a combination of these two approaches, grouping observations now according to form and now according to meanings.”

In the section of “introduction” in this volume, Leech refers to grammatical terminology of ‘tense’ and ‘aspect’ as follows:

The term ‘tense’ is used not only for the primary distinction of Present Tense and Past Tense, but also for the sub-categories Present Perfect Tense, Past Progressive Tense, etc. The term ‘aspect’ is reserved for the primary categories of Perfect Progressive modification.

The description above is fairly enough to lead us to regard Leech’s analysis as depending upon the grammatical forms, i.e., ‘perfect form’ and ‘progressive form.’ It is not difficult to indicate that his approach to ‘aspect’ is employed and developed in one of the most exhaustive contemporary grammar books, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (1985), which is thought as a revised version of *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, and has a great deal of achievements attained in the field of linguistics for the last decade. Leech may be a distinguished expert of the experts dealing with problems about ‘tense’ and ‘aspect,’ but it could be wondering whether he fails in drawing a line between the notion ‘tense’ and the notion ‘aspect’ in his analysis. That might be because even such an expert does not show a clear and accurate picture of ‘perfect’ including its form and meaning, to which we will refer again in the later chapter.

**Notional Difference between TENSE and ASPECT**

Through a close investigation of the historical survey in English syntax, it
proves that only a few grammarians give us a firm distinction between 'tense' and 'aspect,' because of confusion of these two notions. Hence it might be helpful to re-capture the matter of 'tense' and 'aspect' with treating them on the semantic level.

According to Bernard Comrie, Aspect (1976), we can obtain a categorical distinction between 'tense' and 'aspect' in semantics. Tense may be a deictic category as defined in the following remark:  

Since tense locates the time of a situation relative to the situation of the utterance, we may describe tense as deictic.

On the other hand, aspect may express an internal temporal constituency as defined in the following remark:  

As the general definition of aspect, we may take the formulation that 'aspects are different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation.'

In other words, tense makes an absolute time reference, while aspect makes a relative time reference.

Giving familiar examples, we will think of the brief outlines of 'relative tense' and discuss the related problems.

(1) When walking along the path in the park, we often meet Mr. Jackson.
(2) When walking along the path in the park, we often met Mr. Jackson.

The present participle 'walking' in both of the sentences obviously expresses a situation of 'walking' is to occur in the same temporal span indicated by the main verb of each sentence, with no relation to tense. This fact allows us to conclude that in the English tongue, finite verb forms represent 'absolute tense,' and non-finite verb forms, i.e., what we call 'present participle' and 'preterit participle,' suggest 'relative tense.' Then we step forward to taking the following example.

(3) Having been in Tokyo before World War II, Mr. Smith is surprised to see drastic changes there.

The sentence (3) can be paraphrased to (4) as follows:

(4) Because he was in Tokyo before World War II, Mr. Smith is surprised to see drastic changes there.

The perfect form 'having been' in the sentence (3) does not directly have relation to tense indicated by the main verb 'is surprised' of the sentence, but expresses that 'to be in Tokyo' is a situation occurring before 'is surprised,' i.e., it implies 'relative tense.'

These facts prove that 'perfective (aspect)' has to be thought different from 'perfect form,' because the meaning of 'perfect' of English verbs does not necessarily correspond to 'perfectiveness' or 'complete phase' of an action. Namely, the function of the English perfect may well be said fundamentally to associate a certain situation with a previous situation to it, so that it is not reasonable purely to take its function either as 'tense' or 'aspect.' Concerning whether 'perfect form' implies 'perfective' or not, it can be said that it does not depend upon the form 'have + preterit participle.'
i.e., it does less depend upon the verb ‘have’ itself, but it depends upon the lexical meaning of ‘preterit participle.’

In this respect, we happen to notice an inadequacy for treating of perfect forms even in Leece’s *Meaning and the English Verb*, in which the discerning scholar regards perfect forms as perfect aspects as follows:

It is well known that English has two chief ways of indicating past time by means of the verb: the Past Tense (*I worked, he wrote*, etc.) and the Perfect Aspect (*I have worked, he has written*, etc.); also that these two can be combined to form the Past Perfect (or ‘Pluperfect’) (*I had worked, he had written*, etc.) signifying ‘past in the past’. My maintask, in this chapter, is to show how the Perfect is distinguished in meaning from the Past, first of all concentrating on the Present Perfect Tense.

Ambiguity of the term ‘perfect,’ as a result, allows Leece to attach great importance to the form of perfect.

Standing on the point of the characteristics of grammarians who would not recognize a hypothesis as a grammatical category until they find it definitely having both its form and its meaning, it is not difficult to understand that Leece has no other way to treat them as such. We certainly appreciate the way of approaching to aspects like that of Leece; all the same, concerning the notion of ‘aspect’ semantic approaches are necessary to allow us to describe aspects of ‘aspect,’ in an appropriate way.

John Lyons, professor of linguistics in University of Sussex, published *Semantics* in two volumes (1977), in which he refers to ‘tense’ and ‘aspect’ with the rest of related problems. In chapter 15 (Deixis, Space and Time), we come across an interesting description about ‘time reference’ as follows:

Traditional discussions of the grammatical category of tense do not give sufficient emphasis to the fact that it is a deictic category; and they tend to be misleading in other respects also.

Lyons develops his semantic approach to tense in chapter 17 (Modality) as follows:

Something must now be said about tense, and more generally about temporal reference in relation to modality. For simplicity, we will operate with the traditional notions of past, present and future. It was pointed out earlier that there is no reason in principle, why language, even if it has tense, should grammaticalize deictic temporal reference in terms of the traditional tripartite system; and that most languages that have tense treat the distinction of past and non-past as being of greater importance than the distinction of present and non-present or future and non-future. ...Throughout this chapter and the previous chapter we have tacitly assumed that tense, unlike modality, is part of the propositional content of an utterance.

Turning to his remarks about ‘aspect,’ the following definition is given in chapter
15 (section 6): 27

That the notion of aspect, if not the term 'aspect' itself, is less familiar to non-linguistics than are the notions of tense and mood is largely a matter of historical accident. ...the terms 'perfect' and 'imperfect' (which derive from the Latin translations of 'complete' and 'incomplete') came to be used in collection with 'tense'. Furthermore, the definitions of the so-called present, perfect, imperfect and pluperfect tenses, not only in Greek and Latin, but also in other languages, tend to obscure the difference between past vs. present vs. future, on the one hand, and perfect vs. imperfect, on the other.

Referring to Comrie 28 in many parts, Lyons classifies aspectual oppositions into seven groups.

(i) stative vs. non-stative
(ii) dynamic vs. non-dynamic
(iii) stative vs. dynamic
(iv) durative vs. non-durative
(v) punctual vs. non-punctual
(vi) durative vs. punctual
(vii) progressive vs. non-progressive

It is unfortunate that Lyons does not definitely explain whether these classes of aspects are semantically on the same level or not. This means that we inevitably fix our attention to Comrie's classification of aspects in order to understand Lyon's, and Comrie's semantic analysis will be the pivot of our consideration.

An Outline of the Classification of ASPECT

Before observing Comrie's classification of aspects, we will confirm the three types of classifications which are mentioned in Dictionary of English Linguistics. 29

1. Grammatical Aspect

This type is classified on the basis of formality of morphology, in which only two aspects like 'progressive aspect' (be + -ing) and 'perfective aspect' (have + -en) are admitted. Leech's analysis re-examined in the previous chapter and several analyses in the structure of auxiliaries in Generative-Transformational Grammar discussed also in the previous chapter, belong to this type of classification.

2. Contextual Aspect

This type is defined by the phrasal units combined with verbs and the contextual meanings of a given sentence which are changeable in various circumstances. We can admit several items of aspects in this mold. George O. Curme is a typical grammarian standing on this point of view, whose analysis has been observed in the previous chapter. The outline of his classification shall be illustrated here again:
1. Durative (Progressive) Aspect
2. Point-action Aspect
   i) Ingressive aspect
   ii) Effective aspect
3. Terminate Aspect
4. Iterative Aspect

When discussing his approaches to aspect, we are obliged to point out the fact that Curme’s classification has a divergence in the established levels between 'durative (progressive) / terminate aspect' and 'point-action aspect.' They do not seem to be the homogeneous categories on the same grammatical level, although Curme does not refer to such difference among aspektual distinctions.

3. Lexical Aspect

This type is classified in accordance with lexical meanings of each verb, in which we can find mainly two kinds of aspects, i.e., 'durative aspect' expressed by static verbs and 'momentaneous aspect' expressed by action or dynamic verbs. This classification seems to be traditional and appropriate for describing English aspects. However, there emerges inconsistency when discussing aspect only on the basis of lexical meanings of verbs. It is not expected to be easy to analyze an action (dynamic) verb which is supposed to express 'momentaneous aspect.' For example, in a sentence such as "Kate was reading a book when I entered the room," the action (dynamic) verb 'entered' does represent 'momentaneous aspect' which means completion of the action; while it can include a series of approaches to get into the room, such as grasping a knob of the door, turning it, opening the door, taking a step forward, etc.; in this respect, it never represents 'momentaneous aspect' in a strict sense. In spite of the fact like this, the reason why it seems to be correct to treat the verb 'entered' as a verb expressing 'momentaneous aspect' in the sentence, is closely connected with a contrast to the main verb of the sentence, 'was reading.'

In summary, it is just in contrast with the two verbs that a range of meaning of 'momentaneous aspect' in that sentence will be decided.

When it is set and recognized in the definite internal temporal frame, a momentaneous aspect can mean a durative aspect. Therefore, the present writer thinks that connotation of the term ‘expanded’ of 'Expanded Tense' advocated by Jespersen is to suggest the definite internal temporal frame should be enlarged.

So far the conventional classifications of aspect have not been sufficient for us to understand aspektual distinctions in general, thence it will be helpful to analyze them on the more abstract level in accordance with Comrie’s.


Comrie’s analysis on the more abstract level, making use of a concept of binary oppositions, indicates a kind of aspektual hierarchy as follows.
Judging from this diagram, it is clear that a categorical level between Perfective and Imperfective is different from a categorical one between Progressive and Non-progressive. In other words, 'perfective aspect' does not correspond to the opposite category from 'progressive aspect' because of the imbalance between the two. In this case we remember that Curme makes the same aspectual distinction as Comrie's, though he might not be surely aware of an abstract concept of hierarchy existing among aspects.

In English grammar, 'progressive aspect' expressed by progressive forms (be + ing) seems to have been more emphasized than 'perfective aspect' expressed by perfect forms (have + en) or by preterit participles only. Does this mean that the analysis of 'progressive aspect' has more importance than that of 'perfective aspect'? According to Comrie, however, the distinction between 'perfective' and 'imperfective' is superior and dominant to the distinction between 'progressive' and 'non-progressive' in the sense of categorical levels. Therefore, it is quite reasonable to think the notional category 'perfective' as the more important concept which provides us with a firm consciousness of the notion of aspect.

Insofar as we have surveyed a historical outline of the studies on verbal aspects in the traditional grammar (in Part I), and we have made a close investigation into the problems surrounding 'aspect' in the structural linguistics, in the generative-transformational grammar, and in the recent English grammar: the London school, even discerning grammarians probably have more or less difficulty in defining 'aspect' as a grammatical category and drawing a firm distinction between 'tense' and 'aspect' on the syntactical level.

This fact is obviously enough to lead us to concentrating our attention on a semantic approach to 'aspect' and understanding an abstract notion of 'aspect' on the basis of Comrie (1976). In syntax G. N. Leech is a scholar who develops his theory and analysis on the matter of 'tense' and 'aspect,' while in semantics it is B. Comrie who makes a valuable remark on them. Through reading their theses, we keenly realize that our attention and concern should be turned to 'perfect' with 'perfective aspect.'

In the following chapter, the present writer shall represent the matter of 'markedness of perfective' and meaning of 'perfective aspect,' so as to search for a non-conventional way of approach to capturing the reality of ASPECT in the English tongue.

To be CONTINUED.
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3. Ibid., pp. 106–111.

4. Ibid., p. 138.


7. Ibid., pp. 118–121.


14. This volume is the author’s doctoral dissertation presented to the University of Michigan in 1971.

15. In this volume, Newmeyer classifies ‘begin-class verbs’ into three groups, making use of the transformational strategies.

16. Geoffrey N. Leech and Jan Svartvik, *A Communicative Grammar of English*, pp. 63–76 (1975), in whose sections 103–139 (Time, tense and aspect), we can find the distinction between the two meanings of verbs, i.e., ‘states’ and ‘events,’ with a special emphasis on the relation to ‘tense’ and ‘aspect.’


18. Ibid., p. vii.

19. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (1985) was designed and written by the same four editors of *A Grammar of Contemporary English* (1972), with the help of David Crystal.


21. Ibid., p. 3.

22. Comrie does not exactly think it like the present writer’s. Comrie divides tense into two classes; one is an absolute time reference, the other is a relative time reference. This device in his analysis seems to be similar to Sweet’s ‘primary tense’ and ‘secondary tense.’

23. The matter of the lexical meaning of preterit participles will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

24. G. N. Leech (1971), p. 30 (§. 53). Tomoko Yasutake also indicates the same point, especially about the grammatical forms, ‘I have worked’ and ‘he has written,’ in her thesis "A
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