

CHAPTER FIVE

AMBIGUITIES IN THE ASPECTUAL SYSTEM OF ROMANIAN: THE CASE OF PERFECT FORMS

ION GIURGEA

I examine the contexts in which the Romanian compound perfect has a present perfect interpretation, concluding that Romanian has at least two types of perfect, a resultative and a perfect-time-span-inclusion perfect, for which a (partially) unitary analysis is proposed. I also provide an analysis of *de*-temporal modifiers, arguing that they can be selected as arguments by certain Asp heads (Perfect_{PTS} and Imperfective). I then examine the past perfect ('pluperfect'), concluding that a further aspectual operator needs to be acknowledged, the Anterior, for which a semantics based on Bohnemeyer (2014) is adopted. I briefly address the implications of this finding for the analysis of the compound perfect.

Keywords: perfect, aspect, resultative, anterior, pluperfect

1. Introduction

The Romanian verbal system has a number of aspectually specified forms (the imperfect = past imperfective, the past and the future perfect) as well as forms unmarked for the perfective/imperfective distinction (the present and the future). The so-called 'compound perfect' (a periphrastic form which, in the indicative, consists of clitic auxiliary forms based on *have* + Participle) is aspectually ambiguous in a different way: it can function as a present perfect and as a past perfective, translating both the English present perfect and the perfective reading of the English simple past:

(1) a. Concertul tocmai s-a **terminat**.
 concert-the just REFL-has finished
 ‘The concert **has just ended**.’

b. În anul următor turcii **au invadat** Bulgaria.
 in year-the following Turks-the have invaded Bulgaria
 ‘In the following year the Turks **invaded** Bulgaria.’

The contexts where the compound perfect has a perfect reading are largely known from the previous literature (see Crăiniceanu 2005, Vişan 2006, Stoicescu 2013). My contribution consists in an in-depth analysis of the various types of perfect readings and in extending the discussion to the pluperfect, for which an additional reading has to be acknowledged.

2. When the Compound Perfect is a present perfect. Types of Perfect

In its perfect aspect reading, the Compound Perfect represents a combination of present Tense and perfect Aspect. In order to speak of such a combination, instead of a past perfective, we need evidence for the use of the present (speech-time, in main clauses). I adopt here the approach to Perfect initiated by Reichenbach (1947), in which three time intervals are distinguished: Event Time (ET), the time of the described event¹, Reference Time (RT) and Speech Time (ST). For what I called the ‘time of evaluation’ I will keep the term RT (other terms are ‘Topic Time’ (Klein 1994) and ‘Assertion Time’ (Demirdache and Uribe-Etxebarria 2002)). The criterion for speaking of a present perfect interpretation is that RT is (or overlaps with) ST and at least a part of ET precedes RT. In this view, Aspect relates ET and RT, whereas Tense relates RT and ST. As we will see, there are several ways of relating the described event with RT, resulting in several varieties of perfect readings.

2.1 De-modifiers

The clearest evidence for a combination of a present RT and a past event is provided by *de*-modifiers. Generally speaking, *de*-modifiers are oriented towards the LB (left boundary, i.e. starting point) of an interval (the preposition *de* has various uses that represent developments of the spatial meaning ‘from’, which also characterized its ancestor, Lat. *dē*; the temporal meaning can be described as ‘temporal origin’):

(i) *de* + a localizing modifier (i.e. modifier of temporal location, also called ‘positional’) situates the LB of an interval; this type is compatible

with all aspects, see (2); in this example, I use a past RT, indicated by *ieri* ‘yesterday’ (a temporal location adverb that places the RT inside the day before ST), because the three aspects—imperfective, perfective and perfect—are distinctively marked in the past, by the tenses ‘imperfect’, ‘compound perfect’ and ‘pluperfect’, respectively:

(2) Ieri, Maria {vorbea / a vorbit / vorbise } [de [la trei]].
yesterday Maria speak.IMPF has spoken had-spoken from at 3

With the imperfective, the sentence translates as ‘Yesterday, Maria had been speaking since 3 o’clock’: the modifier indicates the beginning (LB) of ET, and RT is included in ET (the event is ongoing at a past RT included in ‘yesterday’; on the meaning of the imperfective Aspect in Romanian, see Giurgea and Stoicescu 2022). With the perfective (marked by the compound perfect), the sentence in (2) translates as ‘Maria spoke starting from 3 o’clock’. Again, the modifier indicates the LB of ET. With the pluperfect, the sentence may translate as ‘Maria had spoken at/since 3 o’clock already’, the modifier indicating either ET or the beginning of an interval anterior to RT in which the event occurred (we will come back to the readings of the pluperfect in section 3);

(ii) *de* + an extent modifier measures the interval from the LB of an interval to RT. In the imperfective, this interval is filled with the event ongoing at RT:

(3) Maria vorbea [de [trei ore]].
Maria speak.IMPF from three hours
'Maria had been speaking for 3 hours.'

In the perfective, as RT is not included within ET, *de*-extent modifiers are out (because of *ieri*, the example (4) cannot represent a present perfect use of the Compound perfect):

(4) * Ieri, Maria a vorbit [de [trei ore]].
yesterday, Maria has spoken from three hours

In the perfect, *de*-extent modifiers measure the ET-RT interval or an interval that includes the ET and ends at RT (the ‘perfect time span’):

(5) Maria vorbise [de [trei ore]].
Maria had-spoken from three hours
'Maria had spoken (since) 3 hours before.'

As *de*-modifiers are either excluded with the perfective (see *de*-extent modifiers in (4)) or yield a different meaning (see *de*-localizing modifiers in (2)), they provide a test for a perfect interpretation of the compound perfect. This test shows that the compound perfect may have a perfect reading, in which the RT (end of the measured interval) is interpreted as being ST, which means that the compound perfect in this context is a *present* perfect:

(6) Maria a vorbit [de [trei ore]].

Maria has spoken from three hours

‘Maria spoke 3 hours ago / has spoken since 3 hours ago.’

With the compound perfect, *de*-modifiers are associated to two distinct readings:

(i) *De* localizes the ET or measures the ET-RT interval. This use of *de*-phrases obeys certain constraints, which entitles us to label this reading **resultative**: either the verb has a result state as part of its meaning, and this state still holds at RT, see (7), or the perfect is used in a context where the event was planned, had to occur in order to fulfill some goals, see (8); ex. (9) shows that if these conditions are not fulfilled, *de*-modifiers cannot be used²:

(7) Nu mai e nimeni. Angajații au plecat {de două ore / de la no more is nobody employees-the have left from two hours from at cinci}.

five

‘There’s nobody in. The employees have left for two hours (now) / left at 5 o’clock.’

(8) a. [Context: Ion has to run every day as part of his training]

Ion a alergat de trei ore / de la trei.

Ion has run from three hours from at three

‘Ion has already run since three hours ago / since 3 o’clock.’

b. [Context: Maria’s discussion with the president was planned, was a point on an agenda that belongs to the common ground of the conversation]

Maria a vorbit cu președintele de trei ore / de la trei.

Maria has spoken with president-the from three hours from at three

‘Maria has already spoken with the president since three hours ago.’

(9) [context: no conversation with the president in the common ground;
brand-new information]

Am vorbit cu președintele de trei ani / din 2019.
have.1 spoken with president-the from three years from-in 2019
Intended: 'I spoke with the president three years ago / in 2019.'

The examples in (8) can be analyzed as resultative by assuming a contextual result state characterized by the fact that a requirement is fulfilled (the so-called 'job-done' interpretation, see Kratzer 2000).

(ii) The **inclusion reading**: the event occurs *inside* the interval whose LB or extent is specified by the *de*-phrase. This interval was called 'extended now' by McCoard 1978 and relabeled *perfect time span* by Iatridou *et al.* (2001), because it is not specific to the present perfect. I will adopt the later term, using the abbreviation PTS. In this reading, the *de*-modifier usually behaves as topical—it is either preverbal or postverbal but deaccented, see (10) and the contrast between (11)a, where the reading is resultative (ET occurred on Saturday) and (11)b, which has a PTS reading (the event occurred between Saturday and ST; for (11)b, imagine a context where the topic under discussion is what Maria did between Saturday and ST):

(10)a. Am făcut MULTE de ieri dimineață.
have.1 done many.FPL from yesterday morning

b. De ieri dimineață, am făcut multe.
from yesterday morning have.1 done many.FPL
'I've done many things since yesterday morning.'

(11)a. Maria a vorbit cu președintele de SÂMBĂTĂ.

Maria has spoken with president-the from Saturday
'Maria spoke with the president on Saturday already'

b. Maria a vorbit cu PREȘEDINTELE de sămbătă
Maria has spoken with president-the from yesterday
'Maria has spoken with the president since Saturday'

The PTS reading normally occurs in sentences in which the number of occurrences of an event (during an interval) is at issue: it is often found with phrases indicating the number of occurrences (see (12)), with negation, which indicates 0 occurrences (see (13)), with the additive clitic adverb *mai* 'again, more' which indicates that the event has occurred before (see (14)), with frequency adverbials, see (15), with elements introducing pluractionality, such as plural DPs, see (16)-(17):

(12)a. De ieri, m-a sunat **de cinci ori**.
 from yesterday me-has called of five times
 'Since yesterday, (s)he has called me five times.'

b. De trei luni își vizitase părinții **doar o dată**.
 from three months 3REFL.DAT had-visited.3SG parents-the only one time
 'For three months (s)he had visited her/his parents only once.'

(13) **Nu** m-a sunat/**Nu** mă sunase de trei luni.
 not me-has called not me had-called.3SG from three months
 '(S)he hasn't/hadn't called me for 3 months'

(14) De vineri, a **mai** plecat / **mai** plecase cineva.
 from friday has more left more had-left.3SG somebody
 'Since Friday, somebody else has/had left.'

(15)a. De atunci, a călătorit / călătorise **rar**.
 from then has travelled had-travelled.3SG seldom
 'Since then, (s)he has/had seldom travelled

b. De zece zile **tot** a apărut /apăruse la televizor.
 from ten days on-and-on has appeared had-appeared.3SG on TV
 'For ten days (s)he has/had kept appearing on TV.'

(16) De atunci, a călătorit / călătorise **în diverse țări**.
 from then has travelled had-travelled.3SG in various cities
 'Since then, (s)he has/had travelled to various countries.'

(17) De zece zile am **ținut două conferințe**.
 from ten days have.1 hold two lectures
 'For 10 days I've given two lectures.'

In case these elements are absent, the occurrence of the event must be considered somehow remarkable, surprising—see (18) and (11)b above:

(18) De ieri, a nins!
 from yesterday has snowed
 'Since yesterday, it has snowed.'

2.2 An analysis that provides a partial unification of the resultative and PTS readings

The two readings of the perfect uncovered in the previous sub-section by the test of *de*-modifiers can be partially unified by making the following assumptions:

(i) a PTS is introduced in both readings: it is an interval that has RT as its final subinterval; *de*-phrases modify this PTS;

(ii) The relation between PTS and the event is mediated by another operator, which is distinct for each of the readings:

(ii.a) in the resultative reading, a Resultative operator introduces a time interval that begins when the event is completed and throughout which its result state holds; this interval, which represents the PTS, is an initial subinterval of the result state (the formula in (19) states that the Resultative takes a temporal property *P* as an argument and yields another temporal property, that of being an interval *t* characterized by the fact that there is an event *e*₁ of type *P* and *e*₂ is its result state and *t* is an initial subinterval of the time span of *e*₂, i.e. *t* begins when the result state begins)³:

$$(19) \llbracket \text{Resultative} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle i, \text{st} \rangle} \lambda t \lambda w \exists e_1 \exists e_2 [\text{Result}(w, e_2, e_1) \wedge t \subseteq \tau(e_2) \wedge \neg \exists t' (t' \subseteq \tau(e_2) \wedge t' < t) \wedge P(w, e_1)]$$

(ii.b) in the inclusion reading, the operator introduces *an interval that includes an event* (this is the PTS); this meaning corresponds to the Perfective aspect, so we may use the same operator:

$$(20) \llbracket \text{Perfective} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle i, \text{st} \rangle} \lambda t \lambda w \exists e [\tau(e) \subseteq t \wedge P(w, e)]$$

(iii) The perfect is a higher operator that maps the PTS onto its final subinterval (this is the RT, the interval whose relation to ST is indicated by Tense; the PTS ends at RT, therefore Perfect must characterize the RT as the final subinterval of the PTS); the denotation of this operator is given in (21), and the structures underlying the two readings are given in (22):

$$(21) \llbracket \text{Perfect}_{\text{PTS}} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle i, \text{st} \rangle} \lambda t \lambda w \exists t' [P(t')(w) \wedge t \subseteq t' \wedge \neg \exists t'' (t'' \subseteq t' \wedge t'' > t)] \quad (\text{simple version})$$

(22) a. $\llbracket \text{Perfect}_{\text{PTS}} [\text{Resultative} [vP]] \rrbracket$ resultative reading
b. $\llbracket \text{Perfect}_{\text{PTS}} [\text{Perfective} [vP]] \rrbracket$ PTS-inclusion reading

For example, for the resultative perfect in (7), the Resultative operator in (19) introduces an interval that starts at the moment they left and throughout which the result state of this event (the fact that they are gone) holds. The adverbial *de două ore* measures this interval, and *de la cinci* localizes its LB. Then, the $\text{Perfect}_{\text{PTS}}$ operator in (21) maps this interval onto its final sub-interval. This final sub-interval (which represents the RT) is identified with ST by the present Tense. For the inclusion perfect in

(11)b, the operator in (20) introduces an interval which includes Mary's conversation with the president. The adverbial *de sămbătă* localizes the LB of this interval. Finally, the $\text{Perfect}_{\text{PTS}}$ operator in (21) maps this interval onto its final sub-interval, which is identified with ST by Tense.

This analysis by and large follows Pancheva (2003), with two significant differences. First, she characterizes the PTS for resultatives as a *non-final* rather than *initial* subinterval of the result state; I find this at odds with the meaning of *de*-modifiers in resultatives, which indicate the initial moment of the result state, not a time within it:

(23) Maria a venit de la 2 \neq Maria a venit de la 3
 Maria has come from at 2 Maria has come from at 3

If the PTS had been just a non-final subinterval of the result state, then, in a situation where the result state holds at ST, the sentence would be true for any LB (indicated by the *de*-localizer) situated between the starting point of the result state and ST, which is not correct (see (23): in a situation where Maria came at 2 o'clock and ST is 4 o'clock, we cannot use a resultative PTS whose LB is 3 o'clock).

Secondly, for the operator 'Bounded', which I called 'Perfective', she gives a strict inclusion reading $(\tau(e) \subset t)$. I remain agnostic on this point because the issue of a 'universal' reading of the Romanian perfect is unsettled.

Now, the analysis must show how the PTS combines with *de*-modifiers. Table I summarizes their distribution:

Table I: the distribution of *de*-modifiers

	<i>de</i> + extent	<i>de</i> + location
Imperfective	✓	✓
Perfect	✓	✓
Perfective	*	✓

As argued in Giurgea & Stoicescu (2022), the imperfective introduces an event ongoing at some t , whose continuation after t does not hold at the world of evaluation, but only in 'normal' worlds wrt. a non-interruption ideal (see Dowty's 1979 'inertial worlds'; for the idea that the imperfective is a 'generalized progressive', see Bary 2009, Deo 2009, Ferreira 2016). What is asserted is a *part* of the event, which ends at RT (cf. Landman 1992, Portner 1998)—see (24), which characterizes the

existentially bound event e that ends at RT as a non-final part of an event e' of type P that occurs in inertia worlds:

$$(24) \llbracket \text{Asp}_{\text{impf}} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle v, \text{st} \rangle} \lambda t \lambda w \exists e [\forall w' [(w' \in \text{Best}(\text{Circ}, \text{NI}, e, P, w) \rightarrow \exists e' [e \subset e' \wedge \exists t' (t' \subseteq \tau(e') \wedge t' > \tau(e)) \wedge P(e')(w')]] \wedge t \subseteq \tau(e) \wedge \neg \exists t'' (t'' \subseteq \tau(e) \wedge t'' > t)]]$$

The worlds in which the event continues are defined using the Best operator taken from Portner (1998), which takes as arguments a circumstantial modal base (Circ), an ordering source based on a non-interruption ideal (NI), the event to which the non-interruption refers (e) and also the description by which this event is introduced (P)⁴.

Given this semantics, how do *de*-extent modifiers combine with the imperfective? In previous work (see Giurgea & Stoicescu 2022), we adopted von Stechow's (2002) analysis of German durative *seit*, according to which the modifier takes a property of times that holds of a larger interval, measures this interval and opens up its final subinterval for further specification: the modifier characterizes the event as ongoing over an interval that ends at RT and measures this interval. But this analysis does not account for the use of *de*-extent modifiers with the perfect, because, according to (21), it is the Perfect operator that introduces an interval that ends at RT, rather than the modifier. Therefore, I propose a new analysis: I take *de*-modifiers to be an *optional* argument of Asp_{impf} , a property of times applied to the temporal trace of the partial event introduced by Asp . When Asp_{impf} selects a *de*-modifier (possibly realized syntactically as a specifier), it will have the denotation in (25), instead of (24), where T is this property of times that will be saturated by the *de*-modifier (the additions wrt. (24) are boldfaced):

$$(25) \llbracket \text{Asp}_{\text{impf}} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle v, \text{st} \rangle} \lambda \mathbf{T}_{\langle i, \text{st} \rangle} \lambda t \lambda w \exists e [\mathbf{T}(\tau(e))(w) \wedge \forall w' [(w' \in \text{Best}(\text{Circ}, \text{NI}, e, P, w) \rightarrow \exists e' [e \subset e' \wedge \exists t' (t' \subseteq \tau(e') \wedge t' > \tau(e)) \wedge P(e')(w')]] \wedge t \subseteq \tau(e) \wedge \neg \exists t'' (t'' \subseteq \tau(e) \wedge t'' > t)]]$$

Under this analysis, *de*-extent modifiers have a simpler denotation, simply measuring an interval:

$$(26) \llbracket \text{de } x\text{-time} \rrbracket = \lambda t \lambda w \text{length}(t)(w) = x$$

This analysis straightforwardly extends to the Perfect, where the final subinterval is introduced by the $\text{Perfect}_{\text{PTS}}$. Therefore, we enrich (21) by

introducing an argument for the *de*-modifier, as we did for the imperfective (again, the added parts are boldfaced):

$$(27) \llbracket \text{Perfect}_{\text{PTS}} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle i, \text{st} \rangle} \lambda T_{\langle i, \text{st} \rangle} \lambda t \lambda w \exists t' [P(t')(w) \wedge T(t')(w) \wedge t \subseteq t' \wedge \neg \exists t'' (t'' \subseteq t' \wedge t'' > t)] \quad (\text{extended version})$$

This analysis has a welcome result for *de*-localizing modifiers: they simply characterize the LB of some interval, a denotation that extends to all their uses, including the combination with the perfective in (2). The first argument of *de* is a PP that denotes a property of times; in (29), this property is ‘at 3 o’clock’. *De*+PP attributes this property to the left boundary of some time interval (*t* in (28)):

$$(28) \llbracket \text{de} \rrbracket = \lambda T_{\langle i, \text{st} \rangle} \lambda t \lambda w T(\text{LB}(t))(w)$$

$$(29) \llbracket \text{de} [\text{la } 3] \rrbracket = \lambda t \lambda w \text{AT}(w, \text{LB}(t), 3 \text{ o’clock})$$

(the left-boundary of *t* is at 3 o’clock)

With the perfective, localizing *de*-modifiers apply to ET, after the application of an operator BOUNDED that maps a property of events onto a property of times (cf. Giurgea & Stoicescu 2022).

According to this analysis, in localizing *de*-modifiers *de* is a meaningful preposition that opens up the LB of an interval for modification, see (28), whereas in extent *de*-modifiers *de* is meaningless, it is just used to indicate the fact that the extent modifier is an argument of the heads *Asp_{impf}* or *Perfect_{PTS}*. Therefore, extent *de*-modifiers are restricted to these two aspects, whereas localizing *de*-modifiers are compatible with all aspects.

The denotation in (27) is to be used whenever the perfect combines with a *de*-modifier. However, as we will see in what follows (see especially section 3), the perfect—at least the resultative perfect—does not require a *de*-modifier or other PTS-indicator. For uses where there is no PTS-modification, the denotation in (21)—the ‘simple version’—should be maintained.

2.3 On the issue of a universal reading of the PTS perfect

As defined in (21) and (27), the PTS includes the RT (i.e., ST, for the present perfect), opening the possibility that the event is still ongoing at RT. Of course, this holds for the resultative reading—the resultant state always still holds at RT. One can derive this by encoding in the Result predicate in (19) the fact that the state holds forever after the event, as

proposed by Kratzer (2000) for what she calls ‘resultant states’. But for the PTS-inclusion reading, ongoingness at RT is associated, at least in English, with a special interpretation, the so-called *universal* reading, in which the event holds throughout the entire PTS. The existence of this reading in Romanian is disputable, because most of the time, Romanian uses the imperfective aspect in combination with a *de*-modifier in order to indicate the LB of an event ongoing at RT, as in (3) above; thus, in (30) the present perfect is not felicitous:

(30) {Sunt/??Am fost} bolnav de zece zile.
am have.1 been ill from ten days
'I've been ill for ten days.'

However, there are examples that seem to allow the universal reading. First, examples with negation, such as (31), are quite common but they are not necessarily ‘universal’, they can also be analyzed as involving negation scoping above an inclusion (‘existential’) reading (as we proposed for (13) above). Better candidates for a universal reading are the sentences in (32) ((32)b is from Stoicescu 2013; *dintotdeauna* in (32)a is the regular phonetic outcome of *de* + *întotdeauna* ‘always’).

(31) De trei zile nu am ieșit din casă.
from three days not have.1 got-out from-in house
'I haven't got out of the house for three days.'

(32)a. A fost așa {dintotdeauna / de când o știu}.
has been so from-always from when her=know.1SG
'She's always been like that / She's been like that as long as I've known her.'

b. De multă vreme mi-am dorit o casă a mea.
from much time me.DAT-have.1 wanted a house GEN my
'I have wanted a house of my own for a long time.'

Unlike (30), these sentences focus on the past interval occupied by the event. However, (32)b is compatible with a continuation such as *și acum dorința s-a împlinit* ‘and now the wish came true’, showing that a continuation at RT is not entailed. Likewise, *de când o știu a fost slabă* ‘She's been thin as long as I've known her’ is not incompatible with the continuation *dar acum s-a îngrășat* ‘but now she got fat’. It appears that only *dintotdeauna* ‘from-always’ requires continuation at RT (see (33)):

(33) A fost dintotdeauna veselă (# dar acum nu mai este).
 has been from-always cheerful.FSG but now not any-longer is
 '(S)he has always been cheerful (/#but she isn't any longer).'

Since in other contexts we do not have clear evidence for the universal reading, it can be assumed that the necessary continuation of the event at RT in (33) comes from a conventional implicature associated to *dintotdeauna*, rather than from a special variety of the perfect aspect. I leave the issue of a universal reading in Romanian for further research.

2.4 *tocmai* and *abia* ‘just’

The adverbs *tocmai* and *abia* ‘just’, when used with the perfect, indicate that a very short time interval separates the end of the event from RT. With the compound perfect, in (34), the RT must be the present:

(34) a. Tocmai a telefonat Ion.
 just has phoned Ion
 ‘Ion has just called.’

b. Abia i-am spus.
 just 3S.DAT-have.1 told
 ‘I’ve just told him/her.’

This is not due to a deictic orientation of these adverbs (i.e., *tocmai* and *abia* are not deictic localizing temporal adverbials like *acum trei zile* ‘three days ago’): as shown in (35), *tocmai* and *abia* can also indicate temporal closeness to a time in the past, and in this case the pluperfect must be used. This shows that *tocmai* and *abia* are oriented to RT, not to ST:

(35) a. Atunci, tocmai telefonase Ion.
 then just had-phoned Ion
 ‘At that time, Ion had just called.’

b. Abia îi spusesem.
 just 3S.DAT had-told.1SG
 ‘I had just told him/her.’

We may thus conclude that in (34), where RT is the speech time, the compound perfect is a present perfect.

As this reading places the event immediately *before* RT, it seems to be more similar to the resultative reading than to the inclusion reading of the

perfect. However, the restrictions on resultatives that we noticed above for *de*-modifiers are not found with *tocmai*: (34)a can be used out-of-the-blue, unlike (36):

(36)[out-of-the-blue]

A telefonat Ion { acum / #de} câteva minute.
has phoned Ion now from a-few minutes
'Ion called some minutes ago.'

A possible explanation is that the temporal closeness between ET and RT indicated by *tocmai* makes the anterior event somehow relevant for the situation ongoing at RT (the current discourse situation) and thus licenses a result state, cancelling the contextual requirements that otherwise apply to verbs with no lexical result state. Alternatively, the perfect with *tocmai* can be analyzed as an inclusion perfect where *tocmai* signals a very short PTS.

In the case of *abia*, there is a requirement of relevance at RT: the use of *abia* in (34)b is not felicitous without a particular context setting. It has a concessive flavor, indicating that the current situation was expected to be different because of the past event—e.g., the person whom the speaker talked to does not behave as expected given what the speaker told her. Likewise, (37) is appropriate in a context where the hearer expected to receive a phone call from the person who had left, who was supposed to call upon arrival at the destination. The speaker points out that the shortness of the interval between ET and RT=ST, indicated by *abia*, is at odds with this expectation:

(37) Abia a plecat, nu avea cum să ajungă.
just has left not have.IMPF.3SG how SUBJ arrive.3
'(S)he's just left, (s)he could not have arrived by now.'

2.5 The perfect marking anteriority with respect to generic present and future events

A further situation in which the compound perfect has a present perfect interpretation is when it occurs in an adjunct subordinate clause and is in the scope of a quantifier over events in the matrix:

(38) Vizitatorii ies pe aici după ce **au urcat** în turn.
 visitors-the go-out through here after that have.3PL gone-up in tower
 ‘The visitors get out this way after they have gone up into the tower.’

In (38), there is no single past RT which includes the event described by the compound perfect *au urcat*. This event is anterior to each individual event in the scope of the generic operator in the matrix. It is not necessarily anterior to ST: as the generalization continues into the future, the events described by the subordinate clause include future events.⁵ Given that the subordinate clause cannot have a past RT, its Tense must be present.

As the present can be futurate, the non-past perfect can show anteriority wrt. a future event:

(39) Am pus afişul, deci mâine turiştii vor returna
 have.1 put poster-the so tomorrow tourists-the will give-back
 ghidurile pe care **le-*au* primit** la intrare.
 guides-the DOM which CL.ACC-have.3PL received at entrance
 ‘We put up the poster, so tomorrow the tourists will give back the
 guides they have received at the entrance.’

The compound perfect can also be used as anterior to the future in matrix clauses:

(40) Mâine la trei am terminat-o.
 tomorrow at three have.1 finished-it
 ‘Tomorrow at 3 o’clock I will have finished it.’

2.6 Possible further contexts

It has been proposed that the compound perfect should be analyzed as a present perfect when the existence of an event must be checked against the whole time that precedes ST, corresponding to the English ‘experiential perfect’ (see Stoicescu 2013, 61):

(41) Ai fost vreodată la Reykjavik? Eu am fost.
 have.2SG been ever to Reykjavik I have been
 ‘Have you ever been to Reykjavik? Me, I have.’

However, a past perfective analysis is also possible: a topic situation that extends to the entire life span of the subject before ST can be

assumed; as the time of this situation precedes ST, the RT of the clause is past and the verbal form will qualify as a past perfective. Note that *vreodată* ‘ever’ does not force a perfect aspect; the temporal interval on which it quantifies can be explicitly confined to the past—see (42), in which the compound perfect form must be analyzed as a past perfective:

(42) Când ai locuit/locuiai în Franța, ai fost vreodată
 when have.2SG lived /live.IMPF.2SG in France have.2SG been ever
 la picnic?
 at picnic
 ‘When you lived in France, did you ever go on a picnic?’

3. The pluperfect and a further reading of the perfect: the Anterior

In the preceding section, we concluded that a present (or non-past) perfect reading of the compound perfect is certain only when there is evidence that RT is ST or at least non-past.

In other contexts, for instance with topical adverbials that specify a past topical time (arguably functioning as RT) and in narrative contexts, where a past situation is presented in its development, the compound perfect is usually analyzed as a perfective past (see e.g. Stoicescu 2013):

(43) În februarie și-a dat demisia. A fost la multe
 in February 3REFL.DAT-has given resignation-the has been to many
 interviuri, și și-a găsit un post la primărie.
 interviews and 3REFL.DAT-has found a position at city-hall
 ‘In February she resigned. She went to a lot of (job) interviews, and
 found a job at the city hall.’

Note however that the pluperfect, which is analyzed as the past form of the perfect (the combination of past Tense and perfect Aspect), can occur in contexts such as (43):

(44) [Context: at some past RT, the person spoken about no longer had the job the hearer knew about]
 În februarie își dăduse demisia. Fusese la multe
 in February 3REFL.DAT had-given resignation-the had-been to many
 interviuri, și își găsise un post la primărie.
 interviews and 3REFL.DAT-has had-found a position at city-hall
 ‘In February she had resigned. She had been to a lot of (job)
 interviews, and had found a job at the city hall.’

Here is an attested example, showing narrative progression and an imperfective whose RT is identified with the ET of an event in the past perfect (the pluperfect is boldfaced, the imperfective is bold and italic):

(45) Ieșind în curte, pe la orele unsprezece noaptea, Felix se izbi, piept în piept, cu Weissmann. Acesta **venise** Tânziu acasă, **aflase** de invitația lui Felix și **alergase** fară să întrebe asupra motivului. Lumina slabă de prin toate odăile îl **mirase** și **se întreba** dacă trebuie să intre și pe unde să intre.

‘Getting out in the yard at about 11 P.M., Felix bumped into Weissmann. The latter had come home late, had learned about Felix’s invitation and had run (to his house) without asking about the reason. The dim light in all the rooms had surprised him and he was/had been wondering whether he should go in and through which door to go in.’
(G. Călinescu, *Enigma Otiliei*, in *Opere IV*, Editura pentru Literatură, 1966, p.171)

In this use, the pluperfect resembles a past perfective whose RT is set as anterior to a contextually given time. Bohnemeyer (2014), building on Kamp & Reyle (1993), argued indeed that the pluperfect is ambiguous between ‘(resultative) perfect’ and ‘anterior’, defending what he refers to as the traditional view on the English pluperfect (found, for instance, in Jespersen 1924 and Comrie 1976). He calls the Anterior ‘relative Tense’ instead of ‘Aspect’, but places it below Tense. I prefer to restrict ‘Tense’ to the highest temporal operator, allowing multiple grammatical Aspect layers, as in (22) above (where Perfect_{PTS} is above Resultative/Perfective).

According to Bohnemeyer, in the Anterior reading, there are two ‘reference times’: Klein’s (1994) topic time (TT), in which the event time is included (via the Perfective aspect) and a further ‘perspective time’ (PT) with respect to which the topic time is anterior (via the contribution of a higher Anterior operator); the structure he proposes is given in (46), where the temporal relations introduced by the three operators (T_{Past}, Anterior and Asp_{Perfective}) are indicated below each of them:

(46) [Past [Anterior [Perfective [vP]]]]
PT<ST TT<PT ET \subseteq TT

Bohnemeyer further argues that the same ambiguity is found in all perfect tenses except the Present Perfect, which is never Anterior. This account may explain why the Present Perfect is the only perfect form that disallows (definite) ET-localizers (see (47): this ban follows if the

resultative doesn't allow ET-localizers) and is supported by the existence of languages that only have the Anterior (Japanese, Kituba, Korean) or only have the 'Perfect' (Yucatec Maya, Kalaallisut).

(47) Bill {had/***has**/will have} arrived at 7.

Let us now consider whether Bohnemeyer's analysis is necessary for the Romanian pluperfect in (44)-(45). In §2.2 above, we concluded that the Romanian perfect is ambiguous between a Resultative and a PTS-Inclusion reading. This type of ambiguity was not considered by Bohnemeyer. Can the Anterior reading be equated with the PTS-Inclusion reading, or do we need a third reading for the pluperfect data presented in this section? I will argue for the latter alternative.

Let us first have a look at temporal modifiers localizing the ET. In (43)-(44), such modifiers occur in a topic position and would be analyzed, according to Bohnemeyer (2014), as TT-modifiers (i.e. modifiers of the RT associated to the embedded Perfective). But it is not impossible for a temporal localizer to modify the ET. With the perfective, the co-occurrence of a topical localizer with a postverbal localizer seems to indicate co-occurrence of TT and ET modification (Klein 1994)—thus, the boldfaced temporal localizer in (48) may be taken to modify ET:

(48) Ieri, Maria a plecat **la** 6.
yesterday Maria has left at 6
'Yesterday, Maria left at 6.'

An undisputable case of a temporal localizer that does not modify RT is provided by the pluractional imperfective, where the individual events in the scope of a habitual/generic operator or of an overt quantificational adverbial may receive temporal localizers (see *la* 6 'at six' in (49)):

(49) Pe atunci, (în fiecare zi) pleca **la** 6.
by then in every day leave.IMPF.3SG at 6
'Back then, {(s)he used to leave at 6/ every day (s)he left at 6}.'

With the pluperfect, however, although both the ET and the time wrt. which the event is anterior can be overtly specified (see (50)a for the ET and (50)b for the RT), these two specifications cannot co-occur (see (50)c):

(50) a. Maria plescase **la 3.**
 Maria had-left at 3
 ‘Maria had left at 3 o’clock.’

b. **Când am venit**, Maria plescase.
 when have.1 come Maria had-left
 ‘When we came, Maria had left.’

c. * **Când am venit**, Maria plescase **la 3.**
 when have.1 come Maria had-left at 3
 ‘*When we came, Maria had left at 3 o’clock.’

Note now that in order to specify the ET in (50)c one can use a *de*-modifier that indicates the LB of the PTS (this is associated to a resultative interpretation):

(51) **Când am venit**, Maria plescase **de la 3.**
 when have.1 come Maria had-left from at 3
 ‘When we came, Maria had left since 3 o’clock already.’

These data can be explained as follows:

(i) ET localization is disallowed in the resultative reading—therefore, (50)a is not resultative. The reason for this may be the fact that the resultative requires a property of events (<v,st>) and temporal localization requires previous mapping of the property of events onto a property of times (<i,st>) (the same type of explanation was proposed by Giurgea & Stoicescu 2021 for the restrictions on ET-modification with the imperfective);

(ii) The RT adverbial that indicates the time wrt. which the event is anterior is only possible in the resultative (that it *is* compatible with the resultative we know from (51)); therefore, (50)b is resultative.

By (ii), the RT-modifier in (50)c requires (50)c to be resultative. But according to (i), resultatives are incompatible with ET-localizers. Therefore (50)c is ungrammatical.

We may thus conclude that the pluperfect has an additional reading in addition to the resultative, in which it allows ET modification. We already proposed that the perfect in general is ambiguous between a resultative and a PTS-inclusion reading. Should we subsume Bohnemeyer’s ‘anterior’ reading illustrated in (44)–(45) and the examples with ET modifiers such as (50)a to this PTS-Inclusion reading? Recall the two non-resultative analyses mentioned so far:

(52) a. [Past [Perfect_{PTS} [Perfective [vP]]]] (= (22)b)
 RT<ST RT=final subinterval of PTS ET \subseteq PTS
 b. [Past [Anterior [Perfective [vP]]]] (= (46))
 PT<ST TT<PT ET \subseteq TT

Subsuming (52)b under (52)a would require assuming an unspecified PTS. But in section 2.2 we argued for a Perfect_{PTS} head that always selects a PTS-argument (see (27)). Moreover, the distinction between TT and PT, useful in treating examples such as (44)–(45), occupies no place in the semantics of Perfect_{PTS} given in (27) or (21). I conclude that trying to collapse the two readings in (52) opens more problems than it solves.

Going back to ET-localizers, we should notice that they are compatible with an overtly expressed PTS in the inclusion reading, but under certain constraints: as already noticed in section 2.1, the number of occurrences of the event during the PTS must be highlighted. Therefore, (53)a is deviant, whereas (53)b is acceptable⁶:

(53) a. ?? {De la începutul iernii/ De trei luni},
 from at beginning-the.winter-the.GEN from three months
 ninsese/ a nins pe 20 ianuarie.
 had-snowed has snowed on 20 January
 ‘{Since the beginning of the winter/For 3 months} it had/has snowed
 on January 20.’
 b. {De la începutul iernii/ De trei luni}, ninsese/
 from at beginning-the.winter-the.GEN from 3 months had-snowed
 a nins {doar pe 20 ianuarie / pe 13 și pe 20 ianuarie}.
 has snowed only on 20 January on 13 and on 20 January
 ‘{Since the beginning of the winter/For 3 months} it had/has snowed
 only on January 20 / on January 13 and January 20.’

The ‘anterior’ (i.e. non-resultative with no PTS-modifier) does not show such a constraint (see (50)a). This supports the proposal to keep separate the anterior and the PTS-inclusion reading. Under the analysis of *de*-modifiers proposed in section 2.2 (see (27)), in which *de*-modifiers are arguments selected by Perfect_{PTS}, we may assume that the requirement that the number of occurrences of an event over an interval be at issue is characteristic of this specifier-selecting Perfect_{PTS} when it combines with the Perfective (i.e., when it yields the PTS-inclusion reading).

The anterior pluperfect resembles the perfective aspect in allowing co-occurrence of a topical localizer and a postverbal localizer:

(54) În acel an /Cu un an în urmă, Maria fusese la mare **în iunie**.
 in that year with a year in past Maria had-been at sea in June
 ‘That year/One year before, Maria had been at the seaside in June.’

Under the analysis in (46)/(52)b, the first adverbial can be analyzed as modifying the TT (which is introduced by the Perfective), with the second adverbial modifying the ET.

We are led to conclude that there are two varieties of non-resultative pluperfect, distinguished by the presence of a PTS modifier. When such a modifier is present, we have the structure in (52)a. When there is no PTS modifier, the structure is as in (52)b, with an Anterior aspectual head above $\text{Asp}_{\text{perfective}}$ and below T_{Past} . This head places the RT (= TT) *before a contextually given perspective time (PT) that will be ordered by Tense* (as in Kamp and Reyle 1993, Bohnemeyer 2014). Let us assume that the TT, which may be contextually set (see the narrative progression with the pluperfect in (44)-(45)), is a temporal pronoun in the Spec of Anterior (the PT must be left unsaturated at the level of the Anterior in order to become an argument of Tense)⁷:

(55) $\llbracket \text{Anterior} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle i, \text{st} \rangle} \lambda t \lambda t' \lambda w (t < t' \wedge P(t)(w))$
 [Tense [TT-pronoun [Anterior [Perfective [vP]]]]]

The Anterior aspect can also be assumed for the embedded anterior reading in section 2.5 above. Note that ET-modification is unproblematic in this case (see *dimineața* ‘in the morning’ in (56)):

(56) În fiecare zi, sportivii dau înapoi echipamentul pe care
 in each day athletes-the give back equipment-the DOM which
 l-au primit **dimineața**.
 CL.ACC-have.3PL received morning-the
 ‘Every day, the athletes return the equipment that they were provided
 with in the morning.’

Further evidence in favor of a distinction between the anterior and the PTS reading comes from the fact that, for some speakers, the future perfect disallows ET-localizers with no PTS modifier:

(57) [Context: *Cred că la reuninea de sămbătă, vor lipsi mulți*: ‘I think
 many people will be missing at the Saturday’s meeting’]
 % Ion va fi plecat vineri din țară, ...
 Ion will PRF left Friday from country
 ‘Ion will have left the country on Friday, ...’

Not only the resultative ((58)a), but also the PTS-inclusion reading of the future perfect is unproblematic for these speakers (see (58)b):

(58)a. Va fi terminat de scris de două ore.
will PRF finished SUP write.SUP from two hours
'(S)he will have finished writing since two hours before.'

b. De la începutul lunii ne vom mai fi întâlnit
from at beginning-the month-the.GEN REFL will.1PL again PRF met
cel puțin de două ori.
at-least twice
'Since the beginning of the month, we will have met at least twice.'

This indicates that the configuration [Future[Anterior[Perfective is unavailable for some speakers (i.e. the Anterior can only be selected by Past and Present).

As for the resultative, it does not need the presence of a PTS-modifier. This is clearly illustrated in (50)b, where we have a topical adverbial localizing the RT. Here, an ET-modifier is ruled out (see (50)c), which shows that the example is not an instance of Anterior. Another conclusion that we can get from the paradigm in (50) is that the PT cannot be overtly expressed (otherwise, (50)c would be acceptable with the topical adverbial specifying the PT).

4. Conclusions and open issues

We came to the conclusion that the forms labeled 'perfect', at least in the case of the pluperfect, have four underlying configurations—but this does not lead to massive ambiguity, because the overt syntactic material most of the time disambiguates the reading. An ambiguity remains with unmodified perfects that allow a resultative reading (there, the context may indicate whether the fulfillment or result of the event at the RT is relevant or not). The structures and syntactic properties associated with them are summarized in Table II; by Spec I indicate a PTS-modifier that is selected by the PTS head. The labels of the readings are indicated in the first column in italics, after the structure:

Table II: Perfect configurations and their properties

Syntax	PTS-modifiers	ET-localizers	RT-localizers	highlighted number of occurrences
[Spec[PTS[Resultative <i>resultative reading</i>]	obligatory	*	✓	-
[PTS [Resultative <i>resultative reading</i>]	*	*	✓	-
[Spec[PTS[Perfective <i>PTS-inclusion reading</i>]	obligatory	✓	✓	obligatory
[(TT)[Anterior[Perfective <i>anterior reading</i>]	* extent (✓ LB-localizers)	✓	TT: ✓ PT: *	-/+

The properties in the second column follow from selection (there is a PTS head that selects a PTS-modifier). The availability of ET-localizers with configurations embedding a Perfective is probably due to a BOUNDED operator, and their exclusion with resultatives is due to the semantic selection of Resultative ($\langle v < s, t \rangle$ instead of $\langle i, s, t \rangle$). The property in the 5th column is a special requirement of the non-resultative PTS-selecting head, which characterizes the PTS-Inclusion reading.

We may now notice that for the compound perfect only the first three configurations have been described, in section 2. If we think of an Anterior reading of the compound perfect, with PT=ST and TT anterior to PT, we come to a reading indistinguishable from the perfective past (see the example (43), already introduced at the beginning of section 3 in order to highlight the similarities between certain pluperfects and the perfective past). Indeed, the configurations in (59) amount to the same overall interpretation and cannot be distinguished via modification, because PT cannot be overtly specified (as we have seen in section 3).

(59) a. [T_{Past} [Asp_{Perfective} [vP]]]
 TT<ST ET \subseteq TT
 b. [T_{Present} [Asp_{Anterior} [Asp_{Perfective} [vP]]]]
 PT=ST TT<PT ET \subseteq TT

Should we analyze the compound perfect, when equivalent to the English dynamic simple past, as a present anterior (as in (59)b) instead of a past perfective (as in (59)a)?⁸

The answer to this question mainly relies on theory-internal considerations. A present anterior analysis would make the syntax-morphology mapping simpler: the auxiliary *am* would always mark *present* indicative⁹. On the other hand, (59)a may seem preferable because the composition of meaning is simpler: why assume a further PT distinct from TT, when it is not needed? A further argument in favor of a past perfective analysis is that, under the other analysis, it is unclear what rules out the combination Past+Perfective for contemporary standard Romanian. Note that the ‘simple perfect’ or ‘simple past’ tense, taken sometimes to represent an unambiguous Past+Perfective combination (cf. Vişan 2006), is practically no longer ‘alive’ in standard Romanian: it is used neither in the spoken language nor in most registers of the written language (e.g. institutional texts, media reports or scientific work); it is restricted to fictional literature. This clearly shows that the simple perfect is not a grammatical option of the current system of Romanian, but rather a part of a different grammar (an obsolete system still used in fictional literature, or the system of some regional varieties)¹⁰.

Within the past perfective analysis ((59)a), for other Romance languages, Demirdache and Uribe-Etxebarria (2002) tried to solve the morphological problem by proposing that the Past+Perfective and the Present+Perfect configurations have in common a feature AFTER, which sits in Tense in the past perfective and in Aspect in the present perfect (suggestions for extending this view for Romanian can be found in Crăiniceanu 2005 and Stoicescu 2013):

(60) a. [TP ST [[T AFTER] [AspP RT [[Asp Ø] [VP ET ...]]]]] past perfective
b. [TP ST [[T Ø] [AspP RT [[Asp AFTER] [VP ET ...]]]]] present perfect

But our investigation showed that perfect forms involve more complex interpretations: the contribution of the Resultative and the Perfect_{PTS} heads cannot be reduced to a mere feature AFTER (recall the semantic entries in (19), (21), (27)). Demirdache and Uribe-Etxebarria’s proposal can at most find a feature in common between the past perfective and *one* of the types of perfect, the anterior, but the desired inclusion of *all* types of perfect under a single feature that can also be used for the past perfective is problematic.

A definitive answer to the dilemma in (59) would require testing various theories of syntax-semantics mapping of aspect against the entire system of Romanian, and possibly other languages, a task that goes beyond the scope of this article. Therefore, I leave this issue for further research.

References

Bary, Corien. 2009. "Aspect in Ancient Greek. A Semantic Analysis of the Aorist and Imperfective." PhD diss., Universiteit Nijmegen.

Bohnemeyer, Jürgen. 2014. "Aspect vs. Relative Tense: The Case Reopened." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 32: 917–954.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crăiniceanu, Ilinca. 2005. "On the Aspectual Underspecificity of the Romanian Perfect Compus and Its Consequences." In *On Space and Time in Language*, edited by Martiene Coene and Liliane Tasmovski, 115–127. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium.

Demirdache, Hamida, and Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria. 2002. "La grammaire des prédicats spatiotemporels: temps, aspects et adverbes de temps." In *Temps et aspect: de la morphologie à l'interprétation*, edited by Brenda Laca, 125–176. Saint Denis: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.

Deo, Ashwini. 2009. "Unifying the Imperfective and the Progressive." *Linguistics & Philosophy* 32: 475–521.

Dowty, David. 1979. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Ferreira, Marcelo. 2016. "The Semantic Ingredients of Imperfectivity in Progressives, Habituals, and Counterfactuals." *Natural Language Semantics* 24: 353–397.

Giurgea, Ion, and Ioana Stoicescu. 2022. "On Temporal Adjuncts and The Imperfective Aspect in Romanian." In *New Insights into Linguistic Communicative Behaviour*, edited by Mihaela Tănase-Dogaru, Alina Tigău, Ioana Stoicescu, and Mihaela Zamfirescu, 219–251. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Iatridou, Sabine, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Roumyana Izvorsky. 2001. "Observations about the Form and Meaning of the perfect." In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, edited by Michael Kenstowicz, 189–238. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jespersen, Otto. 1924. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Kamp, Hans, and Uwe Reyle. 1993. *From Discourse to Logic*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Klein, Wolfgang. 1994. *Time in Language*. London: Routledge.

Kratzter, Angelika. 1998. "More Structural Analogies between Pronouns and Tenses". *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT)* 8: 92–109.

Kratzter, Angelika. 2000. "Building Statives." *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistic Society* 26: 385–399.

Landman, Fred. 1992. "The Progressive." *Natural Language Semantics* 1: 1–32.

McCoard, Robert W. 1978. *The English Perfect: Tense Choice and Pragmatic Inferences*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Press.

Pancheva, Roumyana. 2003. "The Aspectual Makeup of Perfect Participles and the Interpretations of the Perfect." In *Perfect Explorations*, edited by Artemis Alexiadou, Monika Rathert, and Arnim von Stechow, 278–306. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Paslawska, Alla, and Arnim von Stechow. 2003. "Perfect Readings in Russian". In *Perfect Explorations*, edited by Artemis Alexiadou, Monika Rathert, and Arnim von Stechow, 307–362. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Portner, Paul. 1998. "The Progressive in Modal Semantics." *Language* 74: 760–787.

Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. London: Collier-MacMillan.

von Stechow, Arnim. 2002. "German *Seit* 'since' and the Ambiguity of the German Perfect." In *More than Words*, edited by Ingrid Kaufmann and Barbara Stiebels, 393–432. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Stoicescu, Ioana. 2013. *The Acquisition of Tense and Aspect in Romanian*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.

Vișan Nadina. 2006. *A DRT Analysis of the Perfect in English and Romanian*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.

Notes

¹ I use the term 'event' as a general term encompassing both dynamic event(ualitie)s and states.

² The interval between ET and ST can be indicated by combining *acum* 'now' with an extent modifier, as in Engl. *ago*, but this modifier does not indicate the ET-RT interval: it is always oriented to ST, even if we use the pluperfect (see (i)); we may conclude that *acum*-extent modifiers are deictically oriented localizers that can apply to RT or ET and locate them with respect to ST; this means that the compound perfect in (i) can be considered a perfective past (see also *spoke* in the English counterpart).

(i) Am vorbit/ Vorbisem cu președintele acum trei ani.
have.1 spoken/had-spoken.1SG with president-the now three years
'I spoke/had spoken with the president three years ago.'

³ For the proposal that Asp operators introduce existential binding of the event variable, see Kratzer (1998), von Stechow (2002), Paslawska & von Stechow (2003), a.o.

⁴ Portner (1998) argues that the description of the event matters in establishing what counts as inertia worlds.

⁵ The fact that the perfect occurs in an adjunct ensures that this is not an instance of *relative Tense* (i.e. we are not dealing with Tense-shifting, by which the time with respect to which Past shows anteriority becomes the ET of the matrix instead of ST): in Romanian, the hallmark of relative tense is the present used for simultaneity; temporal clauses do not allow this use, which shows that they do not have relative Tense:

(i) Vizitatorii erau conduși de un ghid când urcau /*urcă în turn.
visitors be.IMPF led by a guide when go-up.IMPF.3PL /PRES.3PL in tower
'The visitors were/used to be led by a guide when they went up into the tower.'

⁶ An anonymous reviewer still finds (53)b odd, as compared to examples with modifiers that explicitly indicate the number of occurrences ('once', 'twice'). This supports the claim that highlighting the number of occurrences is crucial for the PTS-inclusion reading: in (53)b, the number of occurrences is only indirectly indicated (by *doar* 'only' or by using a sum of event localizers).

⁷ Bohnemeyer (2014) leaves both times unsaturated and claims that the auxiliary picks up the *right* topic time (i.e. the PT rather than the TT) "as being the outermost one", but it is unclear how this can be compositionally achieved in his analysis.

⁸ Something similar has been proposed even for the English dynamic simple past, standardly analyzed as a past perfective: Kamp & Reyle (1993), who only have PT and ET (they don't use the notions RT or TT and analyze the RT of imperfectives as PT), analyze the English dynamic simple past as: PT=ST, ET<PT.

⁹ For reasons of space, I do not address here the perfect forms of other moods.

¹⁰ Examples of the simple perfect with a present perfect reading can be found:

(i) Mariana mea plecă de mult de la magazin?

Mariana my left from much from at store

‘Is it a long time since my Mariana left the store?’

(Mădălina Mosneanu, *Răpirea II*, (2), confluente.ro nr. 1618, June 6, 2015)

(ii) Ajunsesi de mult?

arrived 2SG from much

‘Have you been here long?’

(Marian Malcjiu, *Acatiste*, 1, confluence ro no. 2273, March 22, 2017)

(iii) Muri de mult și muzicantul

Many died from much also musician-the

‘The musician also died a long time ago’

The musician also died, a long time ago (Stelian Ivascu - Rezonanță" at <http://sah.ro>)

(Stefan Ivașcu, „Rezonanță”, at <http://sabinina-gradinacuagrsc.blogspot.com/>)

This shows that at least some speakers do not associate the simple perfect to a different meaning (past perfective only) but either treat it as a stylistic variant of the compound perfect or come from regions where this form is alive and can have a present perfect reading.

Present perfect uses appear also to be possible in the Oltenia variety, where the simple perfect is still alive – (iv)-(v) report judgments of an informant from Oltenia (via Ioana Stoicescu, p. c.):

(iv) În casă nu mai e nimeni. Copiii **plecară de două ore.**
in house not any-longer is nobody children-the left from two hours
'There's nobody in the house. The children have left since two hours ago.'

(v) **De ieri,** mă **sună** de cinci ori.
from yesterday me.ACC called.3SG of five times
'Since yesterday, (s)he has called me five times.'

The existence of a present perfect use may also explain how the simple perfect in Oltenia became specialized for hodiernal events (it is more expected for a present perfect to evolve into a recent past than for a past perfective; cf. the use of the English present perfect with *just, today, this morning* etc.).