

# THE CONUNDRUM OF ASPECTUAL SUPPLETION IN ISTRO-ROMANIAN

FABIAN HELMRICH<sup>1</sup>, OANA UȚĂ BĂRBULESCU<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract.** In Istro-Romanian, there are two main groups of verbs, one inherited from Romance, one borrowed from the co-territorial Chakavian Croatian variety. The Croatian-derived verbs are specified for aspect, while the Romance ones are not. Generally, these groups do not interact. However, for a number of verbs previous scholars have claimed that they form suppletive aspectual pairs consisting of a prefixed Croatian-derived perfective verb and a simplex Romance imperfective. Given the anaspectual status of most Romance verbs such an analysis deserves scrupulous empirical verification. In this paper, we survey a comprehensive corpus of Istro-Romanian spanning from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century to the 21<sup>st</sup> century with respect to seven alleged suppletive pairs. After describing their behaviour with respect to Vendlerian verb classes, as well as the semantics of their arguments, we come to the conclusion that we cannot speak of aspectual suppletion in the case of these seven verbs. Rather, some verbs are semantically specialized, so that they cannot conceivably form a pair. Where there is no obvious specialization, the prefixed Croatian verb focuses telicity, while the Romance one does not.

**Keywords:** Istro-Romanian, Vlaški, Žejčanski, aspect, verbal morphology, suppletion, Chakavian, language contact.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Istro-Romanian

Istro-Romanian – as it has been called by linguists since the 19<sup>th</sup> century – is today spoken on the Istrian peninsula in Croatia, in a few villages and hamlets situated to the south and north of Mount Učka, by approximately 120 fluent and active speakers<sup>3</sup>, who fall mostly into the 51–70 and over 71 age groups. There are also speakers who emigrated and live in other cities/areas in Croatia and in the diaspora. As for the number of speakers in the diasporic communities, we only have relative estimates, sometimes contradictory, but not an exact figure.<sup>4</sup> Istro-Romanian speakers are all bilingual. Istro-Romanian does not have national-language

---

<sup>1</sup> University of Oxford, [fabian.helmrich@lmh.ox.ac.uk](mailto:fabian.helmrich@lmh.ox.ac.uk).

<sup>2</sup> University of Bucharest, University of Oxford, Institute for South-East European Studies, [oana.uta@ling-phil.ox.ac.uk](mailto:oana.uta@ling-phil.ox.ac.uk).

<sup>3</sup> Vrzić and Singler 2016: 52.

<sup>4</sup> See Vrzić and Singler 2016: 52; their estimate shows that around 450 speakers live elsewhere in Croatia (in particular, in cities like Matulji, Opatija, Rijeka, Kršan, Labin, Pazin, Pula), and another 400-500 speakers live in the USA (especially New York) and Western Australia. We do not know the ratio of L1 to L2 speakers, their distribution according to age and other socio-linguistic variables.

status, nor does it have a literary written tradition. The UNESCO *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* classifies Istro-Romanian in the category of “severely endangered” languages, and demographic decline is one of the (main) causes. Istro-Romanian has two varieties, one spoken north of Mount Učka, called *Žejănski* in the local dialect, another spoken in the south, called *Vlășki* in the local dialect. Although the two varieties are mutually intelligible, they differ sufficiently to be treated differently.

## 1.2. Bilingualism

Any serious discussion of the linguistic structure of Istro-Romanian must take into account the fact that the speakers are bilingual.<sup>5</sup> Vrzić and Doričić (2014: 107-108) describe the situation between the second half of the 19th century and the first decades of the next century as “individual bilingualism”, and that after the Second World War as “pervasive individual bilingualism”. Recent data provided by Vrzić and Singler (2016: 52) show that older speakers living in Istria are balanced bilinguals, while younger speakers are typically Croatian-dominant. We did not intend in this article to discuss the types and the features that characterize the bilingualism of the Istro-Romanian speakers. We consider that the situation in the Istrian Peninsula is complex, as Istro-Romanian was deeply influenced by Chakavian and standard Croatian. The Chakavian influence should be looked at more carefully as Istro-Romanian was in contact with the Chakavian dialect over a long period of time. Added to this was the influence of the standard, literary Croatian language on both Istro-Romanian and Chakavian, which contributed to the emergence/existence of asymmetrical bilingualism in the Istro-Romanian community. In the present case, the situation of linguistic contact is all the more complicated as the influence of Venetian was exerted both on the Chakavian dialects and on Istro-Romanian (either directly or through the Chakavian dialects).

## 1.3. Corpus

Our data<sup>6</sup> comprise the materials gathered from the 19th century until 2010-2011 and consist of collections of dialectal texts, atlases, glossaries, the Istro-Romanian dictionary (still in progress), and recent archives. We have focused especially on the collections of dialectal texts, because we have needed to know the wider context in which a certain verbal form occurs. Even though we inspected all available materials, we are aware that our data are far from complete, as the materials are collected late (in the 19th century) and not all are accessible directly and in their entirety (for example, most records made in the second half of the 20th century are not available, we have only had access to fragments of them, as is the case with the recordings made by Petrovici and Neiescu, by Kovačec, Sârbu and Frațilă, etc.). Despite these shortcomings, we believe that the data collected are sufficient to illustrate aspectual suppletion and the limits or the extent of the phenomenon.

We have added the recordings made recently in the *Documentation of the Vlashki/Zheyanski Language*, a project led by Zvezdana Vrzić. It includes 44 interviews with speakers of Istro-Romanian in Istria, as well as New York, recorded between 2007 and 2017. Forty-two

---

<sup>5</sup> The fact that the Istro-Romanians are bilingual was noticed as early as the end of the 17th century by Ireneo della Croce and was confirmed by the first field research carried out in the 19th century, regardless of terminology used over time.

<sup>6</sup> See *Sources*.

interviews have been transcribed and translated by community members. We transformed these into a searchable dataset, which forms the contemporary part of our corpus to analyse aspectual suppletion. The dataset consists of around 300,000 tokens and is balanced between Vlășki and Žejãnski. Its semi-structured interviews centre around life in the village, personal stories from the past, as well as attitudes towards language and identity.

#### 1.4. The state of the art

In the three monographs on Istro-Romanian, aspectual suppletion is not mentioned at all (Popovici 1914), or is mentioned *en passant* (Pușcariu 1926), or is described as a frequently occurring phenomenon, in which the imperfective forms (= IPFV) are of Latin origin, while the perfectives (= PFV) are of Croatian origin (Kovačec 1971). Popovici (1914: 111-112) discusses only the cases of verbs of Latin or Slavic origin whose perfectivization is obtained by prefixing (“poćirã”<sub>PFV</sub> and “zepovideĵi”<sub>PFV</sub>). Pușcariu (1926: 252) shows that “[F]or Latin verbs, the Istro-Romanians found themselves in a difficult situation”<sup>7</sup>, and the solution was to create “hybrid formations” (the type “scapã”<sub>IPFV</sub> - “poscapã”<sub>PFV</sub>, etc.) or “especially” by “borrowing some perfective correspondents from the Croatian language” for the “imperfective verbs of Latin origin”. In the inventory made by Pușcariu there are “muŃcã”<sub>IPFV</sub> vs. “poĵdi”<sub>PFV</sub>, “bę”<sub>IPFV</sub> vs. “popi”<sub>PFV</sub>, “mațirã”<sub>IPFV</sub> vs. “smil’i”<sub>PFV</sub>. Kovačec (1971: 126) presents a different picture, as he assumes that the phenomenon is much more extensive than Pușcariu admitted. However, Kovačec mentions that only “in a few cases” are the suppletive pairs “well fixed”<sup>8</sup> in Istro-Romanian (as in the case of “arã”<sub>IPFV</sub> vs. zori”<sub>PFV</sub>, “bę”<sub>IPFV</sub> vs. “popi”<sub>PFV</sub>, to which Kovačec adds two other verbs of Croatian origin “opi”<sub>PFV</sub> and “napi”<sub>PFV</sub>). Apart from the three monographs, the aspect issue was addressed in more detail by Hurren 1969. Hurren 1969: 63 claims that:

“[T]he Suppletion class (...) is one of the more common formations and is illustrated by such pairs as – *be* (imp.) – *popi* (perf.) (to drink), *muŃk<sup>a</sup>* (imp.) – *poĵdi* (perf.) (to eat), *toręe* (imp.) – *spredi* (perf.) (to spin), *ar<sup>a</sup>* (imp.) – *zori* (perf.) (to plough), *sap<sup>a</sup>* (imp.) – *skopeĵi* (perf.) (to dig). This class, viewed synchronically, is merely suppletive, but diachronically it can be seen as a hybrid sub-system since the imperfective component of each pair is quite clearly a Romance verb, whereas the perfective component is Slavonic.”

Comparing these data, we have observed that:

- a) the inventory of suppletive verbs is different, varying considerably from one author to another, despite the fact that they all shared a common hypothesis: suppletion represents the “solution” produced mainly in Istro-Romanian for Latin imperfective verbs, in quite frequent cases and that the suppletion class is one of the more common formations;
- b) in all the abovementioned works, the authors assume that Latin verbs are imperfective, because of their simplex, unprefixated stem and because virtually all the Istro-Romanian verb-morphology inherited from Latin (infinitive, present, imperfect, etc.) continues Latin imperfective morphology. The mechanism for the emergence of suppletive pairs is quite simple then: under the massive pressure of the Croatian language, which distinguishes between imperfective and

<sup>7</sup> Our translation.

<sup>8</sup> Our translation.

perfective, a Croatian perfective verb is borrowed, as a partner to the imperfective Latin verb to align the Romance verbal stock with the Slavic-style lexical aspect system.

## 2. TENSE AND ASPECT IN ISTRO-ROMANIAN

The Istro-Romanian tense and aspect system is the result of contact-induced combination and recombination of inherited Romance and borrowed Slavic features, as well as the loss of features conditioned by contact. Istro-Romanian has one present tense and two future tenses. One future tense expresses anteriority in the future and is restricted to subordinate clauses, the other future tense covers any other event in the future and any other syntactic environment. In the past, Vlășki retains a morphological split in the system between periphrastic past ('Perfect') and synthetic past ('Imperfect'). Although there is no consensus about the specific aspectual meanings of either tense, it is important to recognize that tense choice in the past is aspectually motivated in Vlășki. In Žejănski, there is no such distinction, this dialect has lost its synthetic past tense under the influence of Croatian and, like most contemporary varieties of Croatian, only has one, periphrastic past tense.

### 2.1. Tense

Aspect in Istro-Romanian is expressed through a number of means: tense, periphrasis, superlexical affixation and lexical affixation. For tense, only the past tense in Vlășki expresses *aspectual meanings*, as shown in (1):

- (1) a. *yavika verija ân Šušnjevica nuškarlji fețe din Rika*  
 'some girls from Rijeka always came to Šušnjevica'  
 b. *ši jo-m ku ča kurijera verit pârla ân Lupoglav*  
 'and I came by this bus to Lupoglav'

In these examples, the imperfect and the periphrastic past both indicate a past situation, but relate it to a different orientation moment: a moment in the past and the moment of the speech. The "aspectual effect" of these tenses derives from this feature. Periphrastic past forms relate their states of affairs as anterior directly to the moment of speech. Therefore, these states of affairs are viewed in retrospect, as an indivisible whole, i.e. perfectly. Imperfect forms gain their value of "going on"/ "not-finished" from the fact that their states of affairs occur simultaneously with the past reference points indicated by various elements in the context.

### 2.2. Phasal verbs and habitual/iterative periphrases

Apart from phasal periphrasis expressed with the verbs *pošni* 'begin', *nastavi* 'continue' and *fini* 'end' and an infinitive, Istro-Romanian also has a habitual/iterative periphrasis construction with the verb *užej* and an infinitive. Such a periphrastic construction is also attested in Italo-Romance, which is the likely source of *užej*, although the construction is very rare in Italian, but not uncommon in Venetian (Hurren 1969: 86). It is very common in Istro-Romanian. The phase verb test is reliable for establishing perfectivity in Serbo-Croatian (Milićević 2005).

### 2.3. Superlexical affixation

Superlexical affixes, which were borrowed from Croatian, divide into superlexical prefixes and a superlexical suffix. The superlexical prefixes are not formally distinguishable from their lexical counterparts. However, their meaning and behaviour are quite distinct. In Slavic, superlexical prefixes are derivationally outside the VP, while lexical prefixes are inside the VP (Svenonius 2005). They can therefore participate in prefix stacking and disallow secondary imperfectivization through suffixation. Moreover, their meanings are always temporal, rather than spatial or metaphorical, as is the case for lexical prefixes.<sup>9</sup> These equally apply in Istro-Romanian. Moreover, the Istro-Romanian superlexical prefixes differ from their lexical counterparts in that they can attach to a Romance root. It is therefore sensible to group superlexical prefixes and lexical prefixes separately. The ability to attach to Romance roots also distinguishes the superlexical suffix *-vej/vuj* from lexical suffixes. The suffix carries an iterative/habitual meaning, as seen in example (2):

- (2) *ši vajka omiri spura-vejt -a k-a fost štrigele*  
 ‘and the people always said that there were witches.’

In the example, the suffix shows that people repeatedly and habitually spoke about the existence of witches.

### 2.4. Specified for aspect in the lexicon vs. not specified

On the lexical level, Istro-Romanian verbs are best considered in a Romance and a Slavic category. Kovačec (1971) recognizes that many Romance-derived verbs can be used for both imperfective and perfective meanings. He suggests that they are imperfective, probably because they are morphologically simplex, and that their imperfectivity can be neutralized under the right conditions. However, there is no reason to believe the Romance verbs are specified for aspect in the lexicon. Indeed, verbs in other Romance languages, including Daco-Romanian, are not specified for aspect in the lexicon. Pairs such as *dormi/adormi* (in Daco-Romanian), *dormir/s’endormir* (in French) etc. are completely marginal. It is no less true that in Classical Latin many prefixes still functioned as markers of telicity, but this function “deteriorated by Late Latin” (Wiemar and Seržant 2017: 287, see also Haverling 2003: 125, Cuzzolin et al. 2006: 12). Romance verbs receive aspectual meaning through context, periphrasis and tense. We therefore consider Romance-derived verbs in Istro-Romanian, including Venetian loans, to be aspectually neutral. Slavic-derived verbs, on the other hand, were borrowed with aspectual morphology and concomitant

<sup>9</sup> Svenonius 2005: 229: “Typical diagnostics include the following (some of which are language specific (...)

Superlexical prefixes

- a. do not allow the formation of secondary imperfectives (diagnostic invalid in Bulgarian)
- b. can occasionally stack outside lexical prefixes, never inside
- c. select for imperfective stems
- d. attach to the non-directed form of a motion verb
- f. have temporal or quantizing meanings, rather than spatial or resultative.”

aspectual specification. By and large, simplex and prefixed-suffixed Croatian verbs are imperfective, while verbs with just a prefix are perfective, as illustrated below.

Croatian Verb	Istro-Romanian Verb	Aspect	Gloss
<i>pisati</i>	<i>pišej</i>	IPFV	‘write’
<i>na-pisati</i>	<i>na-pisej</i>	PFV	‘write’
<i>po-pisati</i>	<i>po-pisej</i>	PFV	‘list’
<i>po-pis-ivati</i>	<i>po-piš-uj</i>	IPFV	‘list’

### 3. ASPECTUAL PAIRS AND SUPPLETION IN SLAVIC

Much of the extensive literature on verbal aspect in the Slavic languages assumes a categorical binary distinction between perfective and imperfective (Dickey 1997). Although a limited number of verbs are regarded as biaspectual, the overwhelming majority of verbs (types and tokens) is either perfective or imperfective. Traditionally, descriptions of Slavic grammars group verbs into pairs with one perfective and one imperfective partner. These pairs not only share the same lexical meaning but are also morphologically connected. Two types of pairs can be distinguished:

- a) Bare imperfective – prefixed perfective, e.g. Cro. *pisati* – *na-pisa-ti* ‘write’
- b) Prefixed-suffixed imperfective – prefixed perfective, e.g. Cro. *po-pis-iva-ti* – *po-pisati* ‘list’

The imperfectives in the latter group are often referred to as secondary, as they are morphologically derived from the perfective through suffixation, while in the former group the perfective is derived from the imperfective through prefixation. In all Slavic languages except Bulgarian and Macedonian, perfectives which have an unprefixed imperfective partner cannot regularly derive a secondary imperfective. In many Slavic languages, there is also a third group, where there is no shared etymology between the perfective and the imperfective verb, for example Cro. *kazati* – *reći* ‘say’ or Ru. *klast’* – *polozhit’* ‘put’. Such pairs are often referred to as suppletive.

Suppletion, in the traditional sense, refers to the existence of forms in a paradigm that are not etymologically connected to the other forms in the paradigm. Classic examples include the French verb *aller*, which features the roots *va-*, *i-* and *all-* in different parts of its paradigm or the Italian *vado* ‘I go’ vs *andiamo* ‘we go’. Under this definition, suppletion is found on the level of inflexion (Corbett 2000). Aspectual affixation, on the other hand, is best described as a derivational process.<sup>10</sup> It is, therefore, questionable whether it is appropriate to label cases such as Cro. *kazati* – *reći* as suppletion. Furthermore, the notion of aspectual partners has recently been put into question. Often the meanings of aspectual partners do not match as exactly as the pair model would suggest. Furthermore, the Vendlerian verbal class of aspectual partners may differ, as some classes are incompatible with either aspect. Smith (1997), for example, observes that instantaneous actions, which she calls Semelfactives, can only ever be perfective, while their partners are multi-event activities, i.e. unbounded repetitions of the instantaneous action. These differences between so-called partners suggest that it might be more prudent to consider Slavic verbs individually, rather than in pairs. This

<sup>10</sup> See also Maiden and Thornton 2022: 372: “Another issue is whether the label ‘suppletion’ must be limited to irregular alternations affecting exponents of lexical meaning (roots or stems) or can apply to alternation purely between grammatical affixes, as argued by Haspelmath (...) and Melčuk.”

would, in turn, eliminate the question of suppletion altogether. For the purposes of this paper, we accept the notion of the aspectual pair as the closest possible semantic match between a perfective and an imperfective verb, in order to evaluate previous scholarship on Istro-Romanian, especially Kovačec (1971), which operates with the aspectual pair in mind.

#### 4. SUPPLETION IN ISTRO-ROMANIAN?

Turning now to Istro-Romanian, aspectual pairs of both derivational types are also found in the Slavic verbal stock. Furthermore, a number of scholars (see 1.4) have also suggested a special suppletive category for Istro-Romanian, where the imperfective partner is a simplex Romance verb and the perfective partner is a prefixed Slavic verb. Such an analysis is motivated by the co-existence of Romance and Slavic verbs with very similar meanings in combination with the apparent absence of an unprefixated imperfective Slavic verb, which would form the counterpart of the prefixed Slavic one. For example, the perfective *po-pi* ‘drink’ has no counterpart *\*pi*, however, there is a simplex Romance verb *bę* ‘drink’, which is well attested. Since previous scholars have not provided empirical evidence to support the aspectual specialization of the Romance verb in such instances apart from morphology, it is difficult to say whether we are in fact seeing suppletion or whether the facts are more complex. Using extensive corpus data, we therefore aim to summarize the basic empirical facts in order to address the question of aspectual suppletion in Istro-Romanian. In this paper, we will focus on seven pairs, which by and large fit the morphological definition of a suppletive pair put forward by Kovačec (1971): two verbs one (simplex) Romance and one prefixed Croatian with the same lexical meaning, where there is no simplex Croatian form with the same meaning and stem as the Croatian or such a form is exceedingly rare. The chosen verbs are, moreover, well attested in our corpus.

Romance Verb	Croatian Verb	Gloss
<i>arâ</i>	<i>zori</i>	‘plough’
<i>bę</i>	<i>popi</i>	‘drink’
<i>koče</i>	<i>speči</i>	‘bake/cook’
<i>mânkâ/munkâ</i>	<i>pojdi</i>	‘eat’
<i>mačirâ</i>	<i>smelji</i>	‘grind’
<i>sapâ</i> (only Vlaški)	<i>skopej</i>	‘dig’
<i>uskâ</i>	<i>osuši/rasuši</i>	‘dry’

#### 5. ROMANCE VERBS AND CROATIAN/CHAKAVIAN VERBS – SUPPLETIVE PAIRS?

In our analysis, we start from the following basic premises:

a) lexical aspect is not a matter of verbs alone, but “a compositional effect of verbs and their arguments, primarily within the predicate phrase” (Gvozdanovic 2012: 782, see also Verkuyl 1972, Verkuyl 2012). In agreement with the observations of Gvozdanovic (2012: 782), we believe that “[N]umber and definiteness or specificity of the arguments are thereby decisive for so-called boundedness; bounded states of affairs have an inherent boundary and are referred to as terminative (cf. e.g., Padučeva 2009) or telic (cf. e.g., Barentsen 1998) ”;

b) the scheme of Vendler 1967 – although with a long tradition in aspectual analysis – is insufficient, that is why we have resorted to the additional distinctions introduced by Croft 2012;

c) the terminative/nonterminative distinction is used for “aspectual domain proper”, and bounded/unbounded is used for “lexical oppositions available in the Slavic languages” (Bertinetto and Delfitto 2000: 192), which has led us to consider the dichotomy [ $\pm$ telic] “as a typical actional discriminator”, and a dichotomy [ $\pm$ terminative] “as an aspectual discriminator” (Bertinetto and Delfitto 2000: 194);

d) the lexical/superlexical prefix distinction has been maintained and used in the sense given by Svenonius 2004a, Svenonius 2004b, Milicevic 2004, etc.

e) regarding grammatical aspect, we have considered the analysis proposed by Barentsen (1998) which is based on three hierarchically ordered features: telicity, totality, and sequential connection, but we have especially taken into account the analysis proposed by Klein (1994, 1995), which is based on internal temporal constituency;

f) aspect and actionality are not orthogonal to one another (see Bertinetto and Delfitto 2000: 212)

#### *ară and zori*

Attestations	
<p><i>ară</i><sup>11</sup> (&lt;lat. ARARE) is a verb from conjugation class in -â (conjugation I) and is well attested in the materials gathered in the 19th century (by Maiorescu, Nanu I, Byhan), in the first half of the 20th century (by Bartoli, Glavina, Moraru, Pașca, Pușcariu); it is also present in the investigations carried out and the materials collected in the second half of the 20th century, in both varieties (by Kovačec, Petrovici and Neiescu, Sârbu and Frățilă, Filipi 934, Filipi 1115, Dianich)</p> <p>The verb <i>ară</i> ‘plough’ is attested 18 times in the ELAR corpus</p>	<p><i>zori</i> (&lt; Chakavian <i>zorat</i>, but <i>izorati</i> in standard Croatian, where the verb has the lexical prefix <i>iz-</i> and admits a secondary imperfective <i>izoravati</i>) is a verb from the conjugation class in -i (IV conjugation) and is attested especially in 20th century (by Kovačec and Filipi 1115, Filipi 1160).</p> <p><i>Zori</i> is attested merely 3 times in the ELAR corpus</p> <p><i>Zori</i> is borrowed from a Croatian (Chakavian) perfective form.</p>
	<p><i>priori</i> (&lt; Chakavian <i>priorat</i>, cf. Cr. <i>priorati</i>) is also a verb from the fourth conjugation and is attested before <i>zori</i> in materials collected by Popovici, in ALR II N 1 /20, but also by Kovačec, and Filipi 1115</p> <p>In this case, although the form is perfective, <i>pre-</i> is a lexical prefix in Croatian, which changes the meaning and the syntactic configuration of the verb <i>orati</i>. In Istro-Romanian it also means ‘to break the ground’, but also ‘to plough again’.</p>
	<p><i>poori</i> and <i>podori</i> are mentioned by Kovačec (1971: 127), but we could not find them anywhere else in the corpus</p>

<sup>11</sup> Because Istro-Romanian is used primarily for everyday communication and it has no written tradition, researchers devised different writing systems (based on the Romanian alphabet or on the Croatian alphabet). In this article we use the spelling system developed by Vrzić.



*Configurations.* The transitive verb *ară* has the potential for two construals, participating both in activity construals (with the features + dynamic, + durative, + homogeneous, – terminative) (3), as well as in accomplishment or active accomplishment construals<sup>12</sup> (with the features + dynamic, + punctual, – homogeneous, + terminative) (4).

- (3) a. *kâlji megu ânș ši âru* (Morariu 156, Žejane)  
 ‘horses walk alone and plough’  
 b. *ârę cu plugu* (Petrovici and Neiescu, Nova Vas)  
 ‘he ploughs with the plough’  
 c. *la noj se arâja ku boji ši ku plugu* (Dianich)  
 ‘in our village they would plough/ploughed with oxen and the plough’
- (4) *am arât o njivę* (Bartoli, Šušnjeвица)  
 ‘I ploughed a field’

In example (3) events are viewed from an imperfective point of view (present and imperfect are selected). In example (4) event is viewed from an perfective point of view. In combination with adverbials of the *justo* type (which indicate the moment), detelicization occurs in Žejănski (where the imperfect is lost), but not in Vláški:

- (5) *jelj av justo arât za grâv* (Kovačec, Šušnjeвица)  
 ‘they have just ploughed for the wheat’

In Žejănski, it could also mean they were just ploughing for the wheat. In this case, periphrastic past corresponds with the Imperfect aspect in Croatian/Chakavian by conceptualizing a state of affairs *in medias res*. It is used for actual dynamic situations from the vantage point of the narrator. It requires a part of the process to be realized in the actual world, but leaves open the remaining part including its culmination point. This is case of Topic-Time assertion included in Situation Time.

It appears in structures with the reflexive clitic (see also the example 3c):

- (6) *se âra ku plogu* (Kovačec, Brdo)  
 ‘they plough with the plough’

In the ELAR corpus, the infinitive *ară* is attested with the preposition *za* as well with a motion verb and the modal *putę* ‘can’. There are 3 attestations of *ară* in the imperfect and 8 in the periphrastic past. In terms of argument structure, the working animal can either be the subject or an instrumental preceded by the preposition *ku* ‘with’.

- (7) a. *âsiru nu pote arâ*  
 ‘(the) donkey can’t plough’  
 b. *ku boji s-a arât*  
 ‘they ploughed with oxen’

<sup>12</sup> Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 99, Van Valin 2005: 32–33, where active accomplishments are described as “the accomplishment use of activity verbs” (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 99).

Most attestations do not have a direct object and are focused on ploughing as an activity. However, there is one attestation with a quantified object:

- (8) *kân verija arâ, o njiva se arâja tota zija*  
 ‘when they came to plough, they ploughed one meadow all day’

The above example also shows that *arâ* co-occurs with durative temporal adverbials. *Zori* appears in constructions where the future tense is selected:

- (9) *liha va fi zoritę mâre kând se voj tornârec* (Filipi 1115, Šušnjevića)  
 ‘the piece of land will be ploughed tomorrow when you return’

In examples such as (9) the boundary is reached and the conceptualization of an event in its totality must be understood in the sense that TSit<sup>13</sup> is a subset of TT ( $TT \subseteq TSit$ ). TT must not extend beyond TSit in order to validate the set-subset relation and enable the Perfective aspect. The minimal requirement is that TT should not be smaller than TSit (this corresponds, in fact, to Dickey's (1997) analysis of the Perfective aspect in western Slavic conceptualizing a totality). The relevant inherent boundary is determined by the entire predicate and the carrier of the new property is an inner argument.

But also in constructions in which the present tense is selected:

- (10) *ča votę se pemintu zorę ši posęmirę* (Kovačec, Šušnjevića)  
 ‘then they finish ploughing and sowing the land’

In (10) the event is construed as habitual and illustrated what different authors have labeled non-canonical or relative usage of the present tense (Comrie 1985, Katičić 1991, Langacker 1991, Cutrer 1994, Barić et al. 2003). The point of view assumed in (10) is not that of a direct description of what is given in the actual world at the present moment. The process of *ploughing and sowing the land* can be observed and described in its totality because it does not actually occur at the time of speaking (it is a representation corresponding to an indefinite number of actual instantiations and implies the generalization pertaining to their habitual nature).

It appears in structures with the reflexive clitic:

- (11) *pemintu se na mākīnu zorę* (Kovačec, South)  
 ‘the land is ploughed by machine’

It is attested in constructions with the non-finite form depending on various verbs, in which adverbials that define the end-point of a situation co-occur:

- (12) *ma ațutu ân pemint zori ši posadi ši skopej ši tot. delapodne pârla sera* (Sârbu and Frățilă 79) – in a series with other perfective forms  
 ‘but I help to plough the land, to plant and to dig it. in the afternoon until evening’

In this example the succession of events (first you plough, then you sew, then you dig) further conditions the use of perfective forms, as their endpoints are necessarily lined up.

<sup>13</sup> TSit = Time of the Situation, TT = Topic Time in the sense proposed by Gvozdanović 2012: 785: “Topic Time as confined to the deictic region of the narrator's focal concern (i.e. conceived from his or her vantage point) for which validity of a preaching is assumed. The implication is that Temporal assertion of the predication's validity can then account for temporal uses, and lack of temporal assertion for modal uses.”

In the ELAR corpus, *zori* is attested in the imperfect, the infinitive with the modal *rabi* and the imperfect. The animal/machine used for ploughing can be coded either as the subject or as an PP with *ku*. *Zori* may take a direct object:

- (13) *čã ĉe âstez ra trektoru ân pode ura zori, čã ku boji tota zija*  
 ‘what the tractor would today plough in half an hour, you would (plough) the whole day with oxen’

This example also shows that *zori* co-occurs with quantified temporal adverbials. One attestation of *zori* describes a sequence of actions.

- (14) *čã ĉe zorija ši posija ili posadia ši čã l-a fosta tot niš*  
 ‘what they ploughed and sewed or planted and that was all nothing’

*bę and popi*

Attestations	
<i>bę</i> (< lat. BIBERE) is a verb from the conjugation class in -ę (2nd conjugation). It is attested in the materials collected in the 19th century (by Ascoli, Maiorescu, Ive, Byhan), in the first half of the 20th century (by Bartoli, Popovici, Glavina III, Morariu, Cantemir, in ALR I B, ALR II N 7/2242, Pop), but also in the second half of the 20th century (by Petrovici and Neiescu, Neiescu and Peras, Sârbu and Frațilă, Kovačec, Filipi, Dianich) <i>Bę</i> is a quite frequent verb in the ELAR corpus.	<i>popi</i> (< Chakavian <i>popit</i> , Cr. <i>popiti</i> ) is recorded in the 19th century by Byhan, Weigand II, then in the first half of the 20th century, by Popovici, Pușcariu, Cantemir, Iroaie, Pașca, and in the second half of the 20th century, by Petrovici and Neiescu, Kovačec, Sârbu and Frațilă, Neiescu and Brkarić, Dianich. It is well attested in the ELAR corpus.

*Configurations.* The transitive verb *bę* occurs in activity construals:

- (15) *čela ĉ-a zekârpit gutu beje ši fraje* (Morariu 60, Šušnjevića)  
 ‘he who sewed up the neck drinks and is merry’

The verb is the complement of phase verbs:

- (16) *e kapitanu a pošnit renće bę* (Morariu 139, Žejane)  
 ‘and the captain began to drink further’

The verbs is selected in accomplishment construals:

- (17) *a bejut sâkile kât a vrut* (ALR II N 6/1742)  
 ‘everyone drank as much as they wanted’

In structures with periphrastic past, different adverbials can appear, indicating duration (during the entire day, the whole day) (18) or the end-point of the temporal interval (19).

- (18) *tota zia bejut* (Sârbu and Frațilă 95)  
 ‘he drank all day’

- (19) *s-ă mânăkât, bejiut, kântât ... pârla ser-amânât* (Sârbu and Frățilă 96)  
 ‘they ate, drank, sang until late in the evening’

In examples (18) and (19), despite the periphrastic past, the verbs are detelicized due to adverbials, which allow only for terminativity.

It is attested in structures where the non-finite form is the complement of the verb *dă* or of prepositions:

- (20) a. *otpric-ne ușa ke ne dajec barem zâlik âpa bea!*  
 ‘open the door to give us at least a little water to drink!’  
 (Petrovici and Neiescu, Brdo)
- b. *zeru âș akâsa duku de porč ši de be magâri*  
 ‘they take the whey home for the pigs and even to drink’  
 (Petrovici and Neiescu, Žejane)

In the ELAR corpus, the infinitive *be* occurs 16 times with prepositions *za* and *de* and 14 times with the verb *dă* ‘give’, sometimes as the direct object, sometimes together with a nominal object.

- (21) a. *și çire vut-a frika de je, daveja-lj be ši munkâ*  
 ‘and who was afraid of him, gave him to drink and to eat’
- b. *e dât lj-av ân lik âpa be*  
 ‘and s/he gave him/her a bit of water to drink’

Otherwise, the infinite collocates with phasal and modal verbs, including the prohibitive *nu kutezâ*, verbs of motion and *pijažej*.

The 4 present tense forms all have habitual readings, relating to what somebody drinks or with which additions somebody drinks their coffee.

- (22) *ku lâpte beji?*  
 ‘do you drink [your coffee] with milk?’

There are 3 future, 1 conditional, 10 imperfect and 17 periphrastic past forms.

- (23) a. *ala hmoče voj ši be zâlika. Nazdravlje!*  
 ‘now I will also drink a little. Cheers!’
- b. *dușica vavik de saka zi beveja kafelu, no*  
 ‘the sweetheart always everyday drank coffee’
- c. *niçur n-av fost jâko alergičan ši bejut-am ši lâpte ši tot*  
 ‘nobody was very allergic and we drank milk and all’
- d. *toc a bejut previșe*  
 ‘everybody drank too much’

In finite contexts, the omission of the patient, i.e. what is being drunk, leads to an implicature that alcohol is consumed.

- (24) *zos a fost oștarija, zos s-a bejut*  
 ‘downstairs was a pub, downstairs they drank [alcohol]’

This association with alcohol is reflected in the adjective *bęt* ‘drunk’, which is derived from *bę*. Importantly, this is different from the past participle *bejut* (see also Daco-Romanian *beat* vs *băut*).

As a general rule, *bę* co-occurs with non-quantified patients such as *lăpte* ‘milk’, *ăpa* ‘water’ and *medižije* ‘medicine, as well as non-specific quantifiers such as *ân lik* ‘a little’, *čuda* ‘a lot’ or *previše* ‘too much’.

*Popi* is selected in structures:

– with periphrastic past in which the DO is specified or quantified:

- (25) a. *am popit kvartinu de vir ši am munkat un kustić de karne ši de radić*  
 ‘I drank a quarter of wine and ate a piece of meat and a piece of radish’  
 (Morariu 73, Brdo)
- b. *fętica din Opatie, popit-a spudu de rakije*  
 ‘the girl from Opatia drank the keg of brandy’  
 (Iroaie 29/56, Brdo)

Even when an indefinite occurs, the speaker shows that although he cannot provide information about what was drunk, or the quantity can be inferred from the context (a glass, a bottle etc.), he signals that the action has reached its internal boundary and focuses on the end-phase:

- (26) a. *kând ău čă opravit, atunč ăm mes pârla oštarię, juva ăv čeva popit*  
 ‘after they fixed that, then we went to the pub and drank something’  
 (Sârbu and Frățilă 96)
- b. *la Pepo ăm popit o rakijica bura*  
 ‘at Pepo's house I drank a good brandy’  
 (Sârbu and Frățilă 132)

– with the imperfect:

- (27) *kân se jelj nezdravija cu viru, je popija tot e jă samo pokusija*  
 ‘when they toasted with wine, he drank all, but she only tasted (the wine)’  
 (Kovačec 358, Nova Vas)

The selection of perfective forms *nezdravija*, *popija*, and *pokusija* is motivated by the clear sequential character of these states of affairs. This shows that the Perfective retains its full semantics in combination with the Imperfect. And, moreover, it occurs in combination with other perfectives.

*Popi* occurs in the present:

- (28) a. *jo popes česta mijol ali žmulj de vir*  
 ‘I drink up this glass of wine’  
 (Petrovici and Neiescu, Kostrčan)
- b. *lovci viru ân oštarię, megu nazat, uzigres ši popes čeva*  
 ‘the hunters come to the pub, go back, eat a little and have a drink’  
 (Sârbu and Frățilă 79)

- c. *domaręca kafe popim*  
 ‘we drink coffee in the morning’  
 (Sârbu and Frățilă 152)

– in the imperative:

- (29) *popę kafelu!* (Kovačec, South)  
 ‘drink your coffee!’

– in the future:

- (30) *d-atunęe veę juvavă popi po-ę ęlăž de vir* (Kovačec, Žejane)  
 ‘after that you will drink (each) a glass of wine anywhere’

– in the so-called future-restrictive

- (31) *cire-vo popire va fi täre* (Pușcariu I 9/13)  
 ‘whoever drinks it will be strong’

– in non-finite forms, as a complement of a preposition (32a), after motion verbs, where it has circumstantial value (32b), or as a complement of the verb *dă* (32c):

- (32) a. *gospodinu na mesto de kafelu popi, l-a proljit* (Pușcariu I 30/28)  
 ‘instead of drinking the coffee, the gentleman spilled it’  
 b. *ku mele prijateljice n-ăm mes majmund de șase misec popi kafelu ke n-ăm lăzno*  
 ‘I haven’t gone to drink coffee with my girlfriends for more than six months because I have no free time’  
 (Neiescu and Brkarić, Nova Vas)

- c. *se-j betâr dăvu nuște pojidi ši popi* (Sârbu and Frățilă)  
 ‘if he is old they give him something to eat and drink’

Along with *popi*, there are attestations of *opi* (< Chakavian *upit*, Cr. *opiti*), *napi/nepi* (< Chakavian *napit*, cr. *napiti*) which also come from perfective forms, but which have a slightly different meaning (*opi* = to get completely drunk, and *napi, nepi* = get drunk) and appear in structures with the reflexive clitic. In both cases, these are Croatian perfective verbs. They have lexical prefixes and allow the creation of secondary imperfectives. If in Croatian *na-piti (se)* were a cumulative prefixed verb, then it would represent an exception as it allows the formation of a secondary imperfective: *napijati se* (as well as *opiti se*, which allows the secondary imperfective *opijati se*). But on closer examination, it turns out that *na-piti* does not have the cumulative (= superlexical) prefix *na-* at all; historically, it may have had it, but *na-* here has been reanalyzed as an idiosyncratic resultative prefix.

A special case is recorded in Weigand, but most likely it is *opi* or *napi* and not *popi*:

- (33) *manęe mes-av ân oștarie be ši s-av popit* (Weigand II: 152)  
 ‘before he went to the pub to drink and got drunk’

In the ELAR corpus, *popi* has many fewer non-finite forms than *bę* does. There are 17 infinitives with *pjježęj*, *užęj*, verbs of motion and modal verbs. In the corpus, there are 4 attestations of *popi* with *dă*, but in all cases there is a nominal object as well. Similarly, 3 out of 8 occurrences of *popi* with prepositions are accompanied by a nominal object.

- (34) a. *jă dăt-a ča mije popi*  
 ‘she gave me this to drink’  
 b. *kaši nuškarlji zis-a čirevâ igreј za dobândi za čevâ popi*  
 ‘like some said who plays to get something to drink’

The non-finite attestation in example (35) deserves further attention:

- (35) *pokle m-am pošnjit popi*  
 ‘after I began to drink’

Phasal verbs, especially inchoative ones, generally cannot be used with perfective verbs in Slavic (Milićević 2005). In Istro-Romanian, too, the strongest predictor for imperfectivity is the co-occurrence with the inchoative *pošni* ‘begin’. At first sight, this case is therefore very problematic for the postulated perfectivity of *popi*. However, the verb in the example is reflexive and probably better understood as a verb separate to the *popi* we are concerned with here. It’s meaning is probably closer to *opi se* and *napi se*, both ‘get drunk’, where all three verbs represent different level of inebriation. The aspectual status of these verbs is still problematic, but goes beyond the scope of this paper.

There are 12 attestations in the periphrastic past, 1 in the future and 1 in the conditional. Surprisingly there are no imperfect forms attested.

- (36) a. *vota ku mąja pak am popit an glaž de vir*  
 ‘once I even drank a glass of wine with my mother’  
 b. *je ząjno mižęja čija čevâ popi*  
 ‘he was suddenly going to drink something’

On the other hand, there are 4 imperative forms, which is unattested in the corpus for *bę*.

Unlike *bę*, *popi* is rarely attested without an overt direct object. Even in the cases where it is omitted, it has been recent in the discourse and is therefore still present, as in example (37), where *raš popi* refers to whatever the interlocutor has just poured.

- (37) *nu čuda toči, nu. Nu kuteg jo bę. Jo raš popi.*  
 ‘don’t pour much. I am not allowed to drink. I would drink it’

The direct objects selected by *popi* are generally quantified, although not necessarily specific, which may be surprising, as specificity is often associated with perfectivity. Seemingly, non-specific objects such as *čevâ* and *nušte*, both ‘something’, are still quantified enough to attract perfectivity. Ultimately, they are bounded, even if the exact delineation is not known to the speaker.

*koče* and *peči* vs. *speči* vs. *naspeči*

Attestations	
<p><i>koče</i> (&lt; lat. COQUERE) is a unspecific food-preparation verb (its meanings are to bake, to cook, to fry, to burn) and belongs to the third conjugation. It is well attested in the 19th century by Ascoli, Miklosich, Maiorescu, Gartner, Byhan, in the first half of the 20th century by Popovici, Morariu, Pușcariu, Cantemir, and in the second half of the 20th century by Petrovici and Neiescu, Kovačec, Filipi, and Dianich</p> <p>In the ELAR corpus <i>koče</i> ‘bake’ is attested twice in the present, twice in the imperfect and once in the future. Furthermore, the infinitive appears once with the preposition <i>za</i> and 3 times with the verb <i>pure</i> ‘put’.</p>	<p>As for Croatian verbs, <i>peči</i>, <i>speči</i> and <i>naspeči</i> are attested in Istro-Romanian. Of these, <i>peči</i> comes from an imperfective form (&lt; Chakavian <i>peć</i>, Cr. <i>peč(i)</i>), and <i>speči</i> comes from a perfectiv form (&lt; Chakavian <i>speć</i>, Cr. <i>ispeći</i>).</p> <p>In our data there are differences regarding the moments in which the forms are attested and their frequency. Of the three forms, <i>speči</i>/<i>speci</i> is attested in the first half of the 20th century, by Bartoli and Cantemir, but also in more recent investigations, by Kovačec, Petrovici and Neiescu, Sârbu and Frațilă, and Dianich. In Bartoli's materials, there is evidence that speakers establish a link between the two verbs because they perceive a relation of synonymy between the two verbs:</p> <p><b><i>koče (ali) speci, tot uro-j</i></b> (Bartoli, Šušnjeвица) ‘coče’ or ‘speči’ is the same</p> <p><i>peči</i> is attested by Sârbu and Frațilă (where it means ‘to bake’, ‘to roast’), and by Filipi 3 (only in Žejane, where it means to burn, when talking about the sun):</p> <p><i>sorele peče</i> (Filipi 3 Žejane) vs. <i>sorele coče</i> (Filipi 3, widely attested in the southern villages, less so in Šušnjeвица, where <i>sorele teple</i> is recorded).</p> <p>In the ELAR corpus <i>speči</i> is attested once in an infinitival construction with <i>pure</i>, and 3 other infinitival constructions. There are 5 imperfect and 13 periphrastic past attestations. <i>Peči</i> is attested 3 times, twice meaning ‘causing a burning sensation’, once meaning ‘bake’.</p>
	<p><i>naspeči</i> is the least attested (only by Sârbu and Frațilă). In the only attestation we have, the form is derived from a perfective form (<i>na</i> + <i>speči</i>, although in Croatian, both dialectal and standard, there is only form with the prefix <i>na-</i> attached to the imperfective, <i>na-peć(i)</i>)</p> <p><b><i>čevapči naspečim</i></b> (Sârbu and Frațilă 152) ‘we fry/grill minced-meat rolls’</p>



*Configurations.* The transitive verb *koče* occurs in activity construals (38), in accomplishment construals (with the meaning to burn) (39), in directed and irreversible accomplishment construals (40), and in structures where the non-finite form is selected after the comitative verb (*a*)*žutâ* help or as a complement of the preposition *za* (41):

- (38) *kând pâre kočem* (Sârbu and Frăţilă, index)  
‘when we bake bread’
- (39) *av zdilele copt* (Sârbu and Frăţilă 52)  
‘they burned the clay dishes’
- (40) *pâre s-a kopt ân fugera* (Dianich)  
‘the bread was baked in the iron pan’
- (41) *mes-a žutâ-lj pâra koce ši peknică nepali za pâra koce* (Morariu 57, Šušnjevića)  
‘he went to help him bake bread and heat the oven to bake the bread’

In the ELAR corpus, the non-finite form is selected after the verb *pure*:

- (42) *ča-j buro kân puri kârne koče*  
‘that is good when you put meat to bake/cook’

In the periphrastic past, both the participle *kopt* and *kokut* are attested, the former is largely Vlăški and the latter is exclusively Žejănski.

Direct objects which co-occur with *koče* include foods made from dough, meat as well as coffee and potatoes. *Pâra* ‘bread’ is by the most common direct object (in 43 there is a configuration with the reflexive passive clitic *se*).

- (43) *ânklijide uša perke se pâra koče*  
‘close the door because the bread is cooking’

*Speči/speci* occurs in the present tense (44), the present tense, accompanied by in-adverbials (45):

- (44) *spečim pâre, pogâče ši orahnjâče* (Sârbu and Frăţilă 71)  
‘we bake bread, azymes, walnut brioche-like breads’
- (45) *ân ura se pâra speče* (Kovačec, South)  
‘the bread takes an hour to bake’

In-adverbials, which measure the time it takes to complete an event (with an inherent endpoint), combine with Perfective states of affairs. Example (46) illustrates the periphrastic past:

- (46) *pâra s-a specit* (Petrovici and Neiescu, Šušnjevića)  
‘the bread was baked’

As a non-finite form, it can be the complement of some prepositions:

- (47) *neseči dosti leḡne za **speči** kokotu* (Dianich)

‘to cut enough wood to roast the rooster’

In the ELAR corpus there is one present tense attestation, which has a habitual reading:

- (48) *Ječmiku **se speče***

‘the millet is baked/cooked’

Perfective telic verbs in the present tense may have a habitual reading in Croatian (Dickey 1997). Furthermore, the speaker describes the process of making a coffee substitute here. Such a discourse may be understood as running instructions, which are coded in present tense using perfective verbs in Croatian (Dickey 1997).

Example (49) suggests semantic specialization between *koče* and *speči*, whereby the two verbs denote different food preparation processes. However, upon closer inspection, we find that *kopto* in this case is unlikely to be the participle of *koče*. The example is from Žejănski, where the participle is generally *kokut*. It may therefore be that *kopt* has become an independent adjective in Žejănski, rather than being an adjectival use of the participle.

- (49) *ši kârne ši **spečito** ši **kopto** ši (...)*

‘and meat and baked; things and baked; things’

*Peči* is used twice with the meaning ‘to cause a burning sensation’.

- (50) *ši n-av namažit. Bože ma nogo **av pečit!***

‘and we applied [the cream]. God but it burned a lot!’

Once, however, *peči* is also used with pâre as its object to mean ‘bake’.

- (51) *saka zi se fačeja po do vote forši **pečija** pâra*

‘every day they made maybe twice they baked bread’

*mačirâ/macirâ* and *melji* vs. *smelji* vs. *zmačirâ*

Attestations	
<i>mačirâ/macirâ</i> (<lat. MACHINARI) is a verb of the first conjugation and is attested in the materials collected in the 19th century (by Maiorescu), in the first half of the 20th century (by Popovici, Morariu, Pușcariu, Pașca, Cantemir), but also in the second half of the 20th century (by Petrovici and Neiescu, Kovačec, Sârbu and Frățilă, Dianich)	<i>smelji</i> (< Chakavian <i>samlet</i> , Cr. <i>samljeti</i> ) is a verb of the fourth conjugation, attested in the 19th century (by Byhan, Weigand II), in the first half of the 20th century (by Pușcariu, Pașca, Cantemir) and in the second half of the 20th century (by Kovačec, Petrovici and Neiescu, Sârbu and Frățilă, Dianich)
In the ELAR corpus it is well attested.	
<i>zmačirâ</i> – 1 attestation in the ELAR corpus	<i>melji</i> – 1 attestation in the ELAR corpus

*Mačirâ/macirâ* is selected in directed activity constructions:

- (52) *ân mora măčira se grâvu* (Petrovici and Neiescu, Žejane)  
‘wheat is ground in the mill’

It can appear as a complement of prepositions (such as *za*) or in structures with motion verbs it refers to the purpose of the action indicated by the main verb:

- (53) a. *morica za kafelu măčirâ* (Petrovici and Neiescu, Jesenovik)  
‘coffee grinder (= grinder for grinding coffee)’  
b. *mejen la mora măčirâ grâvu ali turkinja* (Petrovici and Neiescu, Kostrčan)  
‘we go to the mill to grind wheat or corn’  
c. *jelj dâvu grâv, jecmik, sekârę (...), tremęte la morę macirâ si făce kolăcele*  
‘they give wheat, barley, rye (...) send it to the mill for grinding and make kolaches’

(Pușcariu I 40/4)

In the ELAR corpus *mačirâ* ‘grind’ is attested with the preposition *za* 5 times, with modals, including *putę* and the prohibitive *nu kutezâ* 5 times and once with the terminative phasal *fini*.

- (54) *zebranito ča fost-a. Nu s-a kutezât măčirâ*  
‘it was forbidden. You were not allowed to mill’

It appears in the imperfect 4 times and 13 times in the periphrastic past.

Often, *mačirâ* does not have an overt direct object. Overtly expressed patients include *šoja* ‘soya’, *trunklje* ‘corn’, *grâvu* ‘wheat’ and other grains, as well as coffee and stones. The instrument (grinder) is coded with a local preposition, either *ân* or *pre*.

- (55) *kân verija grâvu uskât, kâsa se ân žrni măčirâja*  
‘when the dried wheat came, at home it was ground in the grinder’

The transitive verb *smelji* appears in the present (56), the future (57), the periphrastic past (58).

- (56) *čâ če akâsa smelim pre žârni ši kljemâm ali zičem târce*  
‘what we grind at home on the grinder we call that or we say ‘târce’’  
(Petrovici and Neiescu, Žejane)

- (57) *mę mâje mislit-a ke va smelji za lu porcu* (Dianich 6/4)  
‘my mother thought she would grind for the pig’

- (58) *k-av čela kafe spečit (ali pražit) ši ke l-av smelit (mačirât)* (Cantemir 124, Žejane)  
‘that man roasted coffee and ground it’

As in the case of *koče* and *speči*, and in the case of *mačirâ*, speakers link the verb *mačirâ* of Latin origin with the Croatian verb *smelji*:

- (59) *jo mănĵe-m zis ke se grâwu posea, e ziĉe-se po rumunjski semirâ ši kân se grâwu smelĵe, noj ziĉem mačirâ* (Petrovici and Neiescu, Jesenovik)  
 ‘I used to say that the wheat was 'sown', but in Romanian it is called *semirâ* (= sow) and when they grind the wheat we say *mačirâ*’

*Smelji* ‘grind’ is attested twice with verbs of motion and once with the preposition *za*. Furthermore, it appears 3 times with as an indefinite passive participle.

- (60) *ĉa fost-a ân žârni smeljito*  
 ‘that was ground in the grinder’

There is a present tense attestation, which has a habitual reading. Telic perfective verbs in the present tense can have a habitual reading in Croatian as well (Dickey 1997).

- (61) *ĉâ ĉe se smelĵe, pak vire de palenta*  
 ‘what is ground actually comes from polenta’

With *smelji*, the patient may be omitted. As with *mačirâ* patient arguments include various types of grain as well as coffee and the instrument is coded with the local preposition *ân*, as in example (60).

In the ELAR corpus there is one attestation each of simplex *melji* and prefixed *zmačirâ*. The fact that the *s-* prefix was selected, which is also present in *smelji*, suggests that there is at least some interference between the two verbs.

- (62) a. *šâ mižeja su bârsa ši s-a zmačirât*  
 ‘that’s how it went under the bag and was ground’  
 b. *fârmentin meljit s-av*  
 ‘the corn was ground’

*mânkâ/munkâ/mukâ vs. pojdi*

Attestations	
<i>mânkâ/munkâ/mukâ</i> (< late Lat. MANDUCARE) belongs to the first conjugation and is attested in the 19th century (by Miklosich, Gartner, Weigand II, Nanu II, Byhan), in the first half of the 20th century (by Bartoli J, Glavina and Diculescu, Popovici, Morariu, Pușcariu, ALR I, ALR II N), but also in the second half of the 20th century (by Kovačec, Petrovici and Neiescu, Filipi 229, Filipi 1668, Neiescu and Peras, Dianich)	<i>pojdi</i> (< Chakavian <i>pojes(t)</i> , Cr. <i>pojesti</i> , 3sg pr. <i>pojede</i> ) is attested in the 19th century (by Byhan, Ive, Weigan I and II), in the first half of the 20th century (by Pușcariu, Glavina and Diculescu, Popovici, Cantemir, ALR II N, Iroaie) and in the second half of the 20th century (by Kovačec, Petrovici and Neiescu, Sârbu and Frațilă, Dianich, Filipi 116).
<i>Mânkâ</i> is a frequent verb in the ELAR corpus.	In the ELAR corpus <i>pojidi</i> is less attested than <i>mânkâ</i> .

*Mânkâ/munkâ/mukâ* has the potential to be conceptualized or construed as either an activity (63) or an achievement in the appropriate semantic and grammatical context (64):

- (63) a. *pokle je mânkât-a ši bejut-a* (Morariu 33, Šušnjevića)  
‘then he ate and drank’  
b. *am bejut âpa mânjce neg am munkât* (ALR II N 5/1478)  
‘I drank water before eating’
- (64) a. *ši âm câ ši merindât, omârva âm mânkât* (Sârbu and Frăţilă 96)  
‘and I had lunch, I ate a little’  
b. *am mânkât o boţici čuda kârne* (ALR II N 6/1761)  
‘at Christmas I ate so much meat’

Usually there is no quantization, i.e. the reference of the direct object is not restricted to a specified quantity:

- (65) a. *neka bevu si mârânku ke kât vor* (Petrovici and Neiescu, Šušnjevića)  
‘to drink and eat as much as they want’  
b. *jo n-oj mukâ nikad će tu skuhejri* (Kovačec, Nova Vas)  
‘I will never eat what you will cook’

Sometimes the direct object is quantified, sometimes based on the inferences, the interlocutor can assume from the context an non-specific object:

- (66) a. *marânka tot* (Neiescu and Peras, New York)  
‘he eats all (of it)’  
b. *o zi mârânka de krepâ* (Petrovici and Neiescu, Žejane)  
‘one day he eats until his stomach bursts (= he eats a lot)’

It is also used in non-finite forms, as a complement of some prepositions or of verbs such as *puţe*, *dâ*:

- (67) a. *pekljâru verit-a pekljej ke-š va cevâ neberi zâ munkâ* (Popovici)  
‘the beggar came to beg, to collect something to eat’  
b. *âta zi se pote škuta ši mânka (...) ali sarâ-o ši pote ši vinde* (Petrovici and Neiescu, Nova Vas)  
‘the next day, ricotta can be eaten (...) or it can be salted, and maybe even sold’

In the ELAR corpus the infinitive *mânkâ* regularly occurs with prepositions *za* (20) and *de* (4), as well as verbs of giving and bringing (29), i.e. *dâ* ‘give’, *dili* ‘divide, hand out’, *purtâ* ‘carry, bring’, and *(a)duće* ‘bring’.

- (68) *maj betâra av dus porčilor mânkâ*  
‘the older one brought food to the pigs’

The infinitive is also attested with verbs of motion and modals. Finite forms include present (9), imperfect (10), periphrastic past (48), present (5) and past conditional (1), future

(20) and imperative (1). There is also a noun that displays an identical form with the passive participle *mânkât(u)/munkât(u)*.

- (69) *ženskele kâre kârlji prontivejt-a munkâtu*  
‘the women who prepared the food’

The direct objects associated with *mânkâ* are non-quantified such as *pârșut* ‘ham’, *kobasice* ‘sausages’, *hrâna* ‘food’, *ča* ‘that’, *polenta* ‘polenta’, etc. Direct objects are often omitted, construing eating as an activity.

- (70) a. *prevtu mârânka pârșut pre ulje pražit*  
‘the priest eats ham fried in oil’  
b. *ši tonče s-a majbire mânkât*  
‘and then you ate better’

*Pojidi* appears in the periphrastic past, in structures with inherently quantized nouns (i.e. singular count nouns) that bear the definite article for unique reference or with plural count nouns, but with or without further linguistic or contextual specification of the quantity (*merele* refers to the entire complex object to which *mere* applies), or with mass nouns (*pâra* does not denote the entire substance, but its reference is limited to a specific subportion, and the exact quantity is context-dependent and could be a slice of bread, a loaf of bread, etc.) (71), in the imperative (72), and in the present, when it can be combined with the reflexive clitic.

- (71) a. *lupu a pojdit oja* (Petrovici and Neiescu, Žejane)  
‘the wolf ate the sheep’  
b. *a melj mère a pojdit fecori* (ALR II N 6/1627)  
‘the children ate my apples’  
c. *nuštire lj-av pojdit jezi* (Kovačec, Žejane)  
‘someone ate the goat kids’  
d. *de nuscin a verit Mârlâku si pojdit-a toc poredni fecor*  
‘Mârlâcu came from somewhere and ate all the bad children’  
(Filipi, 116, Šušnjevică)  
e. *domnu pojdit-a pâra si zehvalit s-a*  
‘God ate the bread and gave thanks’  
(Petrovici and Neiescu 1964/210, Šušnjevică)  
f. *dosta kârne am pojdit* (Iroaie 37/102, Nova Vas)  
‘I ate enough meat’
- (72) *kând âlj dekla dusere mânkâtu pre skând, tu pojde-l tot* (Pușcariu I 6/31)  
‘when the maid brings the food to the table, eat it all’
- (73) *ši atunče se pojde ku lingura* (Petrovici and Neiescu 1964/214, Žejane)  
‘and then it is eaten with a spoon’

And the relationship with the inherited verb emerges from the example (74), in which *mânkâ* participates in an activity construal, but the endpoint is encoded by *pojdi*.

- (74) *mânkât-av așâ tustrej pâr la av tot pojdit* (Kovačec, Žejane)  
‘they all three ate like this until they finished eating everything’

In our corpus, both *mânkâ* and *pojdi* can occur with phase verbs:

- (75) a. *kând a finit pojdi* (Pușcariu I 18/50)  
 b. *kând a finit je mânkâ* (Kovačec, Žejane)  
 ‘when he finished eating’

Both verbs are attested in constructions with indefinite + preposition *de* + the infinitive:

- (76) a. *pak au ântrebat se are čevâ de mânkâ* (Morariu 147, Žejane)  
 ‘and he asked if he had anything to eat’  
 b. *dâ čevâ de pojdi* (Kovačec, Žejane)  
 ‘to give something to eat’

In Istro-Romanian, the verb *namânkâ* is also attested. The verb is made up of *na+* *mânkâ* after the pattern of perfective verb *najes(t)/najesti* from dialectal and standard Croatian. *Namânkâ* has a different meaning (‘to sate’, ‘to satiate with food’) and appears, as a rule, accompanied by the reflexive clitic:

- (77) *âstaz m-am namânkât, ke mj-a fost jâko fome* (Sârbu and Frățilă 108)  
 ‘I ate my fill today, because I was very hungry’

The verb can be used without the reflexive clitic:

- (78) a. *acmo više lucsus nâmânkâm* (Sârbu and Frățilă 75)  
 ‘now we eat a lot of fancy food’ (= we eat fancy food until we are full)  
 b. *ši jo nu voi više namânkâ, ke sâm satula do guta* (Sârbu and Frățilă 142)  
 ‘and I will not stuff my face any more, because I am full to the brim with food’

In the ELAR corpus *pojdi* is much rarer than *mâncâ* and used somewhat less with prepositions (15) and much less with verbs of giving and bringing (1). Further are 12 infinitives attested with verbs of motion and modals, as well as 1 future form, 14 imperfect forms, 15 periphrastic past forms, 2 present conditionals, 1 passive and 7 present forms. The present forms express telic habituals and sequences of actions.

- (79) a. *ke se restopesku mânde nego-l ni pojdesku*  
 ‘so they thaw before they eat them’  
 b. *mâra pojde tota pitura*  
 ‘the sea eats all the paint’

There is also 1 indefinite passive participle *pojdito*.

Direct objects of *pojdi* are usually overt and quantified or definite, such as *pârșutele* ‘the ham’, *tot* ‘everything’ or *tote pičorle* ‘all feet’. However, there are also example of non-specific objects such as *čuda*.

- (80) *težâci pojdija čuda*  
 ‘the fat people always ate a lot’

The non-specific *čuda* may be licensed here by the imperfect tense. As with *popi* ‘drink’, *pojdi* licenses *čevâ* ‘something’.

*sapâ* and *kopej* vs. *skopej*

Attestations	
<p><i>sapâ</i> (&lt; lat. SAPPARE) is a polysemous verb and belongs to the first conjugation class and is attested in the 19th century (by Maiorescu, Byhan), in the first half of the 20th century (by Bartoli, Popovici, Morariu, Cantemir and Iroaic), but also in the second half of the 20th century (by Petrovici and Neiescu, Kovačec, Filipi 993, Sârbu and Frătilă, Dianich)</p> <p>In the ELAR corpus <i>sapâ</i> ‘dig’ is only attested in Vlășki.</p>	<p>At the beginning of the 20th century, an isogloss is observed in Bartoli's materials: <i>sapâ</i> vs. <i>kopej</i>, in the sense that the variety spoken in Šušnjevića and Gradine still preserves the verb inherited from Latin, while in Žejane the Croatian verb <i>kopej</i> is recorded. Materials from the 20th century confirm this isogloss (see, for example, Filipi 993)</p> <p><i>Kopej</i> is borrowed from Chakavian <i>kopat</i>, Cr. <i>kopati</i>.</p> <p>The Croatian perfective forms <i>iskopati</i>, <i>okopati</i>, <i>prekopati</i>, <i>raskopati</i> and <i>zakopati</i> all show lexical prefixes and admit secondary imperfectives (<i>iskopavati</i>, <i>okopavati</i>, <i>prekopavati</i>, <i>raskopavati</i>, and <i>zakopavati</i>).</p> <p>The closest semantic configuration to <i>sapâ</i> is that of <i>iskopati</i> from standard Croatian, respectively <i>skopat</i> from Chakavian (which mean to dig (up), to make a hole, to dig out, to excavate). The verb <i>skopej</i> is attested in 19th century by Byhan and Gartner, in Byhan's glossary <i>skopej</i> is translated as <i>ausgraben</i>, <i>aushöklen</i>, while <i>sapâ</i> is glossed by <i>graben</i>, <i>hacken</i>, and in Gartner's inventory, <i>skopej</i> is translated as <i>scavare</i>.</p> <p>See <i>sapâ</i> and <i>skopej</i> distribution in our corpus:</p> <p><i>čire su / sub ât om gropa kopej âns ân ja kade</i> (Morariu 114 /146, Žejane)</p> <p><i>čire sâpe grobu lu ât, âns kâde nuntru</i> (Morariu 99, Letaj)</p> <p>whoever digs a pit for others will fall into it</p> <p><i>cire su ât jâma sâpe ke vo scopej su sire</i> (Kovačec, Šušnjevića)</p> <p>‘whoever digs a pit for others digs it for himself’</p>

*Sapâ* and *kopej* (< Chakavian *kopat*, Cr. *kopati*) have to potential to be construed as activities (81) and accomplishments (82).

- (81) *juve čuda omir, ženske, betâr ši bâbe sapât-av* (Cantemir 12)  
‘where many men, women, old men and old women dug’



- (82) **am kopejt njiva** (Petrovici and Neiescu, Žejane)  
‘I dug the field’

They appear in constructions with phase verbs:

- (83) **kând je zdriv, kumpiru se pošne kopej** (Kovačec, Žejane)  
‘when potatos are ready, they begin to dig them up’

In ELAR, the infinitive *sapâ* is attested twice with an inchoative phrasal verb and 17 times with verbs of motion, *voli* ‘love’ and modals. There are 5 imperfect attestations and 19 attestations of the periphrastic past. The objects *sapâ* takes fall into two semantic categories: mineral resources such as *kârbur* ‘coal’ and *boksite* ‘bauxite’ and plants such as *târsure* ‘vines’ and *tručinje* ‘corn’.

- (84) a. **ân kâva baš sapât-a kârbunu ânutru, ân jâma**  
‘in the cave they mine coal inside in the cave’  
b. **je sapât-a tručinje, e jo-m sirâk**  
‘he dug out the corn and I the sorghum’

*Skopej* ‘dig out, dig up’ is attested in both dialects. However, since *sapâ* is only attested in Vlâški, we will focus on the Vlâški data for *skopej* as well. *Skopej* is attested twice in the present, twice in the imperfect and 7 times in the periphrastic past. The passive participle is also used once adjectivally. *Skopej* takes objects that describe a sort of cavity or soil.

- (85) a. **noj an skopejt o škulje**  
‘we dug a hole’  
b. **s-a skopejt zâlik pemint**  
‘a little soil was dug up’

*uskâ/uškâ* and *osuši* and *rasuši/resuši*

Attestations	
<i>uskâ/uškâ</i> (< Lat. EXSUCARE) is a verb of the first conjugation and is attested in the 19th century (by Gartner, Byhan, Weigand II), in the first half of the century 20th century (by Morariu, Pușcariu, Popovici, Bartoli, Pop, Cantemir, ALR II), but also in the second half of the 20th century (by Petrovici and Neiescu, Kovacec, Sârbu and Frațilă, Filipi 1047, Dianich)	<i>osuši</i> attested in the first half of the 20th century <i>rasuși/resuși</i> is attested in the second half of the 20th century

The verb has the potential for several types of construals and can be conceptualized as activity (86) and directed activity (87).

- (86) **uskâ roba** (Kovačec, Žejane, Brdo)  
‘to dry clothes’

- (87) *je s-a aflât ân un lok juvę s-a uskât roba* (Pușcariu I 6/29)  
 ‘he was in a place where the clothes were hung out to dry’

This is a activity construal that represents an unbounded but incremental directed change on a scale, i.e. an aspectual type distinct from (undirected) activities. That is, Hay, Kennedy, and Levin argue for a distinct aspectual construal of an unbounded but incremental or measurable activity. Thus, the Vendlerian aspectual type of activities is divided into directed and undirected unbounded processes. This is a type that has been named several times, Carlson (1981: 39) describes directed activities as ‘dynamic’; Talmy (1985: 77) describes them as ‘gradient verbs’, and Bertinetto and Squartini (1995) describe them as ‘gradual completion verbs’. Example (88) illustrates the accomplishment class:

- (88) *ča če-j udo s-a uskât* (Popovici)  
 ‘what is wet has become dry’

According to Levin and Hovav (1998), who propose an interpretation based on the complexity of the event denoted by the verb, Activity verbs, with a simple event structure (see *bę, mánkâ*) more easily admit the non-expression of the direct object compared to causative verbs, as is *uskâ*. It appears in constructions with finite forms (see above), but also with non-finite forms, expressing the purpose:

- (89) a. *pure uskâ fažolu afâra* (Bartoli, Žejane)  
 ‘put the beans outside to dry’  
 b. *kâšu se pure uskâ* (Pop, Žejane)  
 ‘the cheese is left to dry’  
 c. *jo kâšu zvades ši-l punj uskâ* (Kovačec, Brdo)  
 ‘I remove (extract) the cheese and put it to dry’  
 d. *spelât-a roba-n potok ši pús-a-vo uskâ* (Dianich)  
 ‘he washed the garment in the stream and laid it out to dry’

It allows combination with the reflexive clitic (see 88 etc.).

In the ELAR corpus *uskâ* ‘dry’ is attested in infinitive constructions with the preposition *za*, the verbs *pure* and *kladi*, both ‘put’ as well as with modals. There is 1 conditional past attestation, as well as 8 imperfect and 13 periphrastic past forms. Strikingly, most present tense forms are in final subordinate clauses introduced by *neka*, which are associated with a goal-oriented action.

- (90) *neka se jâ dâro uska*  
 ‘so it dries well’

The participle *uskât* is also used adjectivally to describe dried herbs, meats, etc. The semantics of the patient argument that *uskâ* takes are quite varied and range from *jâzeru* ‘the lake’ over *slanina* ‘bacon’ to *gura* and *jârba* ‘herbs’.

- (91) a. *kobasice, pârșutele-n uskât, de slanina-n uskât*  
 ‘we dried sausages, ham, we dried bacon’

- b. *mi se gura uska*  
‘my mouth is dry’

The Croatian verbs that are attested in the corpus are *osuši* and *rasuši/resuši*, they come from the perfective forms *usušit* (Chakavian)/ *osušiti* (Croatian), respectively, *rasušit(i)* (*se*). Between the two verbs, however, there are some differences regarding moment of attestation and restrictions of use or specialization:

*Osuši* can appear with or without the reflexive clitic:

- (92) a. *neka osušę* (ALR II N 7/2200)  
‘to dry’  
b. *jo osušes jârba* (Filipi 1047, Žejane)/*jo usku jârba* (Filipi 1047, Žejane)  
‘I lay out the grass to dry’  
c. *jo me voj osuši* (Bartoli, Žejane)  
‘I will dry myself’  
d. *stâbla se osušę* (Filipi 1720, Žejane)  
‘the tree dries up’  
e. *kând se kobasiccele osušes* (Sârbu and Frătilă)  
‘when the sausages dry’

An important piece of information on the relationship between *uskâ* and *osuši* is first given by Bartoli. Bartoli notes that in Grobnik, where *osuši* is attested, the speakers confirm the existence of *uskâ*, and in Brdo, it is children who use *usuši* (influenced by *uskâ*, see also Chakavian *usušit*). The verb of Croatian origin appears in the present, future, etc.

*Rasuši/resuši* appears exclusively in combination with the reflexive clitic:

- (93) a. *bičva s-a rasušit* (Filipi 1275, Žejane)  
‘the barrel has dried out’  
b. *brenta s-a resušit/ bâčva s-a resušit* (Kovačec/ Filipi 1275, South)  
‘the barrel has dried out’  
c. *bâčva ši brenta, kân se ciru far de âpa, se usku, se resušesku* (Dianich)  
‘the barrel and the 'brenta', when kept without water, they dry out’ (in this example, *se resušesku* appears next to *se usku*)

In Croatian, *rasušiti* (*se*) admits the secondary imperfective formation (*rasušivati se*) and occurs only in contexts with the feature (-Human).

In the ELAR corpus *osuši* ‘dry’ is attested once in the conditional and twice in the periphrastic past. Like for *uskâ*, the present tense forms usually appear in final clauses introduced by *neka*.

- (94) *neka se jârba bire osušę*  
‘so the herbs dry well’

The patients that *osuši* selects appear to be quite restricted, only *jâzeru* ‘the lake’ and plants, such as *jârba* ‘herbs’ in (94) are attested.

*Rasuši* is attested once in the imperfect with *bâčva* ‘barrel’ as its patient.

## 6. DISCUSSION

In our survey of seven proposed suppletive aspectual pairs, we have uncovered a very diverse picture, so that we cannot realistically speak of aspectual suppletion as a widespread phenomenon, as Kovačec (1971) suggests. In the case of two pairs, *sapâ* – *skopej* and *uskâ* – *osuși/rasuși* there is clear semantic specialization. For other verbs in Istro-Romanian such specialization has already been described. For example, Romance *ânčepâ* and Slavic *pošni* both mean ‘begin’. Their semantic subcategorizations, however, differ significantly. *Ânčepâ* takes a nominal patient argument such as ‘bread’ or ‘sausage’ and means ‘begin consuming’, while *pošni* is a phasal verb that takes an infinitival complement and means ‘begin an action/state’. Similarly, *sapâ* means ‘prepare the land’, ‘unearth crops’ and *skopej* means ‘make a hole’. *Sapâ* can be used with this meaning, but its such usage is much more restricted. The differences between *uskâ* and *osuși/rasuși* are more subtle. *Uskâ* has the broadest meaning and must select uniquely for a meat product, while *osuși* is only used with plants and the lake (i.e. the local lake which dried up). Lastly *rasuși* is used exclusively with wood. Given these semantic differences we cannot consider *sapâ* – *skopej* and *uskâ* – *osuși/rasuși* aspectual pairs. Irrespective of any aspectual differences, they do not fulfil the basic requirement of maximal semantic similarity to be considered aspectual pairs.

*Bę* – *popi* and *mânkâ* – *pojdi* both have distributions that look incredibly similar to what we would expect from a perfective – imperfective pair. *Bę* and *mânkâ* are most frequent in activity construals and used to describe habits, e.g. *bę kafelu ku lâpte*, while *popi* and *pojdi* are mostly found to describe one-off events and the consumption of a quantified amount. We, however, argue that the difference between Romance and Slavic verbs at issue is not primarily an aspectual one but based on telicity. In most Romance varieties, there is no lexical distinction between ‘eating’ and ‘eating up’ or ‘drinking and ‘drinking up’, while in many other European languages which do not regularly encode aspect, such as German or English, there is such a lexical distinction (the distinction can be made by other grammatical means: e.g., Italian *mangiare* vs *mangiarsi*). This suggests that there is a perceptually salient difference between the activity ‘drink, eat’ and the accomplishment ‘drink up, eat up’ in languages, irrespective of whether they lexically encode aspect or not. The perceptual salience of the two and the lack of distinction of the two in Romance probably facilitated the borrowing of *popi* and *pojdi* into Istro-Romanian. As the other verbs borrowed from Croatian, *popi* and *pojdi* are specified for aspect, they are perfective, but *bę* and *mânkâ* are not necessarily imperfective for this reason. Because of their atelic nature, they are more likely to be found in contexts with imperfective interpretation but this is true for activities on the whole. Given aspectual suppletion has only been proposed for a very limited number of verbs and the overwhelming majority of Romance verbs is clearly not specified for aspect, it seems unlikely that *bę* and *mânkâ* would be exceptionally specified for aspect, while their specification for atelicity would be a less radical change to the analysis of their semantics.

For *mačirâ* – *smelji* and *koče* – *speči*, there are attestations for the Slavic unprefixated verbs *melji* and *peči*, which suggests that these in fact function with their prefixed counterparts as pairs *melji* – *smelji* and *peči* – *speči*. *Mačirâ* and *koče* are therefore merely synonyms to these pairs without aspectual specification. *Koče* is broader in meaning than *peči* – *speči* as well, as it can refer to a number of food preparation methods and not just

baking. The verb *zmačirā* is probably a blend conditioned by the phonological similarity between *mačirā* and *melji*.

Lastly, *zori* is a newer borrowing into Istro-Romanian. While *arā* has been attested since the 19th century, i.e. from our earliest records of Istro-Romanian, *zori* has its earliest attestations in the second half of the 20th century. Here, too, we argue that telicity was decisive factor motivating borrowing, but once again this does not necessitate the aspectualization of *arā*.

Although speakers perceive a relationship between verbs based on their semantic features, it is not sufficient to assume that these verbs are aspectual pairs (see *koče (ali) speci, tot uro-j* (Bartoli, Šušnjevića) and *kān se grāwu smelje, noj zičem mačirā* (Petrovici and Neiescu, Jesenovik). In Istro-Romanian this contrast seems to be used more with an actional than aspectual intention, since the emphasis is put on the telicity of the event. The opposition bounded/unbounded expresses a purely aspectual meaning in Croatian and Chakavian, whereas in Istro-Romanian there is a telicity opposition and its original value is actional. The comparison between Croatian/Chakavian and Istro-Romanian shows that they occupy different stages in terms of the conversion of the original actional meaning into a purely aspectual one.

#### SOURCES

- ALR I = *Atlasul lingvistic român, Partea I (ALR I)*, by Sever Pop, vol. I, Cluj, 1938, vol. II, Sibiu, Leipzig, 1942.
- ALR II N = *Atlasul lingvistic român II*, serie nouă, vol. I–VII, 1956–1972, București, Editura Academiei.
- Ascoli, G. I., 1861, *Studj Critici*, Paternolli, Gorizia.
- Bartoli, M., in: S. Pușcariu (în colaborare cu M. Bartoli, A. Belulovici, A. Byhan), 1929, *Studii istroromâne*, vol. III, *Bibliografie critică – Listele lui Bartoli – Texte inedite – Note – Glosare*, București, Cultura Națională, 99–141.
- Byhan, A., 1899, “Istrorumänisches Glossar”, *Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache*, 6, 174–396.
- Cantemir, T., 1959, *Texte istroromâne*, București, Editura Academiei.
- Dianich, A., 2010, *Vocabolario istroromeno-italiano. La varietà istroromana di Briani ('Bërščina)*, Pisa, Edizioni ETS.
- ELAR corpus = Vrzić, Z., 2018, *Documentation of the Vlashki/Zheyanski language ('ruo')*, Endangered Languages Archive, <https://www.ELARarchive.org/dk0543/>.
- Filipi, G., 2002, *Istrorumunjski lingvistički atlas/Atlasul lingvistic istroromân/Atlante linguistico istroromeno*, Pula, Znanstvena udruga Mediteran.
- Gartner, T., 1882, a. “Materialien zum Studium des Rumänischen in Istrien. b. Italienischer Index zum vorstehenden Vocabular”, in: Fr. Miklosich, „Rumunische Untersuchungen, I. Istro- und macedorumunische Sprechdenkmäler”, *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Classe*, 32, 53–84.
- Glavina, A., 1929/[1904], “Glosar româno-istroromân (1904)”, in: S. Pușcariu (în colaborare cu Matteo Bartoli, Alois Belulović, & Arthur Byhan), *Studii istroromâne*, vol. III, *Bibliografie critică–Listele lui Bartoli–Texte inedite–Note–Glosare*, București, Cultura Națională, 176–199; “Texte din Jeiăni (1904)”, in: S. Pușcariu (în colaborare cu Matteo Bartoli, Alois Belulović, & Arthur Byhan), *Studii istroromâne*, vol. III, *Bibliografie critică–Listele lui Bartoli–Texte inedite–Note–Glosare*, București, Cultura Națională, 211–235.

- Glavina, A., C. Diculescu, 1905, *Calindaru lu rumeri din Istrie*, București, Ștampa Gutenberg, Joseph Göbl.
- Iroaie, P., 1936, *Cântece populare istroromâne*, Cernăuți, Tip. Glasul Bucovinei.
- Ive, A., 1882, "Aufzeichnungen des Herrn Dr. Antonio Ive", in: Franz Miklosich, "Rumunische Untersuchungen, I. Istro- und macedorumunische Sprechdenkmäler", *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Classe*, 32, 2–16.
- Kovačec, A., 1998, *Istrorumunjsko-hrvatski rječnik (s gramatikom i tekstovima)*, Pula, Znanstvena udruga Mediteran.
- Maiorescu, I., 1874, *Itinerar în Istria și vocabular istriano-român (Din manuscriptele postume)*, Iași, Tipo-Litografia H. Goldner.
- Miklosich, F., 1861, *Die slavischen Elemente im Rumunischen*, Wien, Kaiserl.-Königl. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei.
- Morariu, Leca, 1928, *Lu frați noștri. Libru lu Rumeri din Istrie. Cartea Românilor din Istria. Il libro degli Rumeni Istriani*, Suceava, Editura Revistei „Făt-Frumos”.
- Nanu I = Nanu, Ș., 1895, *Der Wortschatz des Istrischen*, Leipzig, Druck von August Pries.
- Nanu II = Nanu, Ș., in: P. Neiescu, *Dicționarul dialectului istroromân*, volumele I–IV, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2011 (vol. I), 2015 (vol. II), 2016 (vol. III), 2019 (vol. IV).
- Neiescu, P., 2011-, *Dicționarul dialectului istroromân*, volumele I–IV, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2011 (vol. I), 2015 (vol. II), 2016 (vol. III), 2019 (vol. IV).
- Neiescu, P., I. Peras, in: P. Neiescu, *Dicționarul dialectului istroromân*, volumele I–IV, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2011 (vol. I), 2015 (vol. II), 2016 (vol. III), 2019 (vol. IV).
- Neiescu, P., V. Brkarić, in: P. Neiescu, *Dicționarul dialectului istroromân*, volumele I–IV, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2011 (vol. I), 2015 (vol. II), 2016 (vol. III), 2019 (vol. IV).
- Pașca, Ș., in: P. Neiescu, *Dicționarul dialectului istroromân*, volumele I–IV, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2011 (vol. I), 2015 (vol. II), 2016 (vol. III), 2019 (vol. IV).
- Petrovici, E., P. Neiescu, in: P. Neiescu, *Dicționarul dialectului istroromân*, volumele I–IV, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2011 (vol. I), 2015 (vol. II), 2016 (vol. III), 2019 (vol. IV).
- Petrovici, E., P. Neiescu, 1964, „Persistența insulelor lingvistice. Constatări făcute cu prilejul unor anchete dialectale la istroromâni, meglenoromâni și aromâni”, *Cercetări de lingvistică*, IX, 2, 187–214.
- Pop, S., in: P. Neiescu, *Dicționarul dialectului istroromân*, volumele I–IV, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2011 (vol. I), 2015 (vol. II), 2016 (vol. III), 2019 (vol. IV).
- Popovici, I., 1909, *Dialectele române din Istria*, Partea a 2-a, *Texte și glosar*, Halle a.d.Saale, Editura Autorului.
- Pușcariu, S. 1906, (în colaborare cu M. Bartoli, A. Belulovici, A. Byhan), *Studii istroromâne*, volumul I, *Texte*, București, Institutul de Arte Grafice Carol Göbl.
- Sârbu, R., V. Frățilă, 1998, *Dialectul istroromân. Texte și glosar*, Timișoara, Editura Amarcord.
- Weigand, G., 1892, "Nouvelles recherches sur le roumain de l'Istrie", *Romania*, 21, 240–256.
- Weigand, G., 1894, "Istrisches", *Jahresbericht für rumänische Sprache*, 1, 122–155.

## REFERENCES

- Barentsen, A., 1998, "Priznak "sekventnaja svjaz" " i vidovoe protivopostavlenie v rusском jazyke", in: M. Ju. Čertkova (ed.), *Tipologija vida: Problemy, poiski, rešenija*, Moscow, Škola "Jazyki ruskoj kul'tury", 43–58.
- Barić, E., M. Lončarić, D. Malić, S. Pavešić, M. Peti, V. Zečević, M. Znika, 1995, *Hrvatska gramatika*, Zagreb, Školska knjiga.
- Bertinetto, P. M., M. Squartini, 1995, "An attempt at defining the class of 'gradual completion verbs' ", in: P. M. Bertinetto, V. Bianchi, J. Higginbotham, M. Squartini (eds), *Temporal Reference*,

- Aspect and Actionality*, volume 1, *Semantic and syntactic perspectives*, Torino, Rosenberg & Sellier, 11–26.
- Bertinetto, P. M., D. Delfitto, 2000, “Aspect vs. actionality: why they should be kept apart”, in: Ö. Dahl (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 189–225.
- Carlson, L., 1981, “Aspect and quantification”, in: P. Tedeschi, A. Zaenen (eds), *Tense and aspect* (Syntax and Semantics, 14), New York, Academic Press, 31–64.
- Comrie, B., 1985, *Tense*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Corbett, G. G., 2000, *Number*, Cambridge, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Croft, W., 2012, *Verbs: Aspect and Causal Structure*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Cutrer, M. L., 1994, *Time and tense in narratives and everyday language*, Ph.D. diss., University of California, San Diego.
- Cuzzolin, P., I. Putzu, P. Ramat, 2006, “The Indo-European adverb in diachronic and typological perspective”, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 111, 1–38.
- Dickey, S. McC., 1997, Parameters of Slavic aspect, Ph.D. diss., Indiana University.
- Gvozdanović, J., 2012, “Perfective and imperfective aspect”, in: R. I. Binnick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*, Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 781–802.
- Haverling, G., 2003, “On prefixes and actionality in Classical and Late Latin”, *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 50, 1–2, 113–135.
- Hay, J., C. Kennedy, B. Levin, 1999, “Scalar structure underlies telicity in ‘degree achievements’”, in: T. Matthews, D. Strolovitch (eds), *Proceedings of SALT 9*, Ithaca, NY, Cornell University, CLC Publications, 127–144.
- Hurren, H. A., 1969, “Verbal aspect and archi-aspect in Istro-Rumanian”, *La Linguistique*, 5, 2, 59–90.
- Katičić, R., 1991, *Sintaksa hrvatskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Klein, W., 1994, *Time in Language*, London, Routledge.
- Klein, W., 1995, “A time-relational analysis of the Russian aspect”, *Language*, 71, 4, 669–695.
- Kovačec, A., 1971, *Descrierea istroromânei actuale*, București, Editura Academiei.
- Langacker, R. W., 1991, *Foundations of cognitive grammar*, volume 2, *Descriptive application*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Maiden, M., A. M. Thornton, 2022, “Suppletion”, in: A. Ledgeway, M. Martin (eds), *The Cambridge Handbook of Romance Linguistics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 317–399.
- Miličević, N. 2004, “The lexical and superlexical verbal prefix iz- and its role in the stacking of prefixes”, in: P. Svenonius, Nordlyd 32.2: Special issue on Slavic prefixes, Tromsø, University of Tromsø, 279–300. Available at [www.ub.uit.no/munin/nordlyd/](http://www.ub.uit.no/munin/nordlyd/).
- Padučeva, E. V., 2009, “Leksičeskaja aspektual’nost’ i klassifikacija glagolov po Maslovu-Vendleru”, *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 6, 3–20.
- Popovici, I., 1914, *Dialectele române din Istria*, Partea 1, *Referințele sociale și gramatica*, Halle a.d.Saale: Editura Autorului.
- Pușcariu, S. (în colaborare cu M. Bartoli, A. Belulovici, A. Byhan), 1926, *Studii istroromâne*, volumul II, *Introducere – Gramatică – Caracterizarea dialectului istroromân*, București, Cultura Națională.
- Rappaport Hovav, M., B. Levin, 1998, “Building Verb Meanings”, in: M. Butt, W. Geuder (eds), *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*, Stanford, CA, CSLI Publications, 97–134.
- Smith, C. S., 1997, *The Parameter of Aspect*, Dordrecht, London, Kluwer Academic.
- Svenonius, P., 2004a, “Slavic prefixes and morphology: An introduction to the Nordlyd volume”, in: P. Svenonius, Nordlyd 32.2: Special issue on Slavic prefixes, Tromsø, University of Tromsø, 177–204. Available at [www.ub.uit.no/munin/nordlyd/](http://www.ub.uit.no/munin/nordlyd/).
- Svenonius, P. 2004b, “Slavic prefixes inside and outside VP”, in: P. Svenonius, Nordlyd 32.2: Special issue on Slavic prefixes, Tromsø, University of Tromsø, 205–253. Available at [www.ub.uit.no/munin/nordlyd/](http://www.ub.uit.no/munin/nordlyd/).

- Talmy, L., 1985, "Lexicalization patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms", in: T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, volume 3, *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 57–149.
- Van Valin, R. D. Jr., R. J. LaPolla, 1997, *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin, R. D. Jr., 2005, *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Vendler, Z., 1967, "Verbs and times", in: Z. Vendler (ed.), *Linguistics in philosophy*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 97–121.
- Verkuyl, H. J., 1972, *On the Compositional Nature of the Aspects*, Dordrecht, Reidel.
- Verkuyl, H. J., 2012, "Compositionality", R. I. Binnick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*, Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 563–585.
- Vrzić, Z., R. Doričić, 2014, "Language contact and stability of basic vocabulary: Croatian loanwords for body parts in Vlashki/Zheyanski (Istro-romanian)", *Fluminensia*, 26, 2, 105–122.
- Vrzić, Z., J. V. Singler, 2016, "Identity and language shift among Vlashki/Zheyanski speakers in Croatia", in: V. Ferreira, P. Bouda (eds), *Language Documentation and Conservation in Europe* (Language documentation & conservation special publication, 9), University of Hawai'i Press, 51–68.
- Wiemar, B., I. A. Seržant, 2017, "Diachrony and typology of Slavic aspect: what does morphology tell us?", in: W. Bisang, A. Malchukov (eds), *Unity and Diversity in Grammaticalization Scenarios* (Studies in Diversity Linguistics, 16), Berlin, Language Science Press, 239–307.