BETWEEN THE PERFECT AND THE PRETERITE – A DRT ANALYSIS OF THE ROMANIAN AND THE ENGLISH COMPLEX PAST

NADINA VIŞAN

This paper investigates the behaviour of the Romanian complex past (*perfect compus*) in relation to its English counterpart (*the Present Perfect*) from a Discourse Representation Theory (cf. Kamp & Reyle 1993) perspective. The data we analyse come from a range of Romance and Germanic languages. Our hypothesis is that the Romanian *perfect compus* (henceforth PC) appears as semantically richer than other 'perfects' and is on the verge of becoming a preterite. We conclude by proposing a scale of perfectivity where the Romanian perfect ranks highest in terms of a [+ preterite] dimension.

1. A MONOSEMIC ANALYSIS FOR THE ROMANIAN *PERFECT COMPUS*

One of the most puzzling problems that is apparent when attempting a DRT analysis of the Romanian complex past has to do with the fact that, unlike its English counterpart, PC appears as ambiguous between an 'eventive' and a 'stative' interpretation. This ambiguity has been frequently mentioned in the literature (Iordan 1937, Iordan, Guțu, Niculescu 1967, Graur 1968, Săteanu 1980, Călăraşu 1987 *inter alia*). Compare for instance the first set of examples, where PC expresses a *completed action closely related to ST*, in the good old 'perfect' tradition, to the second set, where PC appears to express a *completed action which is anterior to speech time*:

(1) a. Ion s-a uitat la televizor până acum.
Ion has watched-PC at TV till now
'Ion has been watching TV so far.'
b. Ion a plecat de la ora 5.
Ion has left-PC since hour 5
'Ion left at 5.'

(2) a. Ion a plecat ieri la ora 5.
Ion has left-PC yesterday at hour 5
'Ion left yesterday at 5.'

RRL, **LI**, *1*, p. 55–71, Bucureşti, 2006

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

b. Maria a mâncat acum o oră.
Maria has eaten-PC now an hour
'Maria ate an hour ago.'

According to the system of analysis we are employing here the first set of examples have a clearly *aspectual, resultative dimension* and are interpretable as expressing an event resulting into a state (e >< s) within the DRT framework. These examples place PC in the same league with the English Present Perfect, itself analysed as introducing events resulting into states in the discourse. On the other hand, the second set of examples might be more of a problem if we consider the *past value* of the time adverbials combined with PC (i.e. *ieri la ora 5, acum o oră*). We must remember that Present Perfect excludes this kind of combination, a phenomenon known under the name of 'the Present Perfect Puzzle' (Klein 1992):

(3) *She has arrived at 5.

It thus appears that PC violates the 'past adverb constraint' and is not subject to any 'Present Perfect Puzzle' effects. If we are then to provide consistent treatment for this tense within the DRT framework, we need to account for this apparent violation. In a previous paper (Vişan 2000) we claimed that *the interpretation of the Romanian perfect is unitary*, thus declaring ourselves in favour of an 'extensional', 'monosemic' approach to PC (see de Swart & Molkedijk 2002, Caudal 2003 for further details for French). The arguments we brought in favour of this claim had to do with both historical data[1] (see Vişan 2006) and data from modern Romanian. Let us list here some of them:

a) An extremely appropriate argument in favour of the stative/resultative interpretation of PC is the fact that a bare PC form, stripped of any contextual material, is always read as resultative:

(4) a. Am venit.
Have-1st pers.sg. come-past.part
'I have come.'
b. S-a dus să mănânce.
Se-refl. have-3rd pers.sg. gone-past part to eat

[1] Caudal (2003) offers a similar kind of argumentation for the 'aspectual' value of the French PC, which is still a 'perfect', due to its 'resultative legacy': "the origins of perfects in general and of the English perfect in particular are *resultative constructions*, themselves derived from stative forms. Perfects are born and die along the lines of a universal cycle beginning with stative forms, evolving into resultative statives, which are gradually grammaticalized as flexional affixes (that is, perfects), describing some result state (their semantics is essentially resultative at this point). Perfects then gradually acquire non-resultative properties; they become notably compatible with narratives based on temporal succession, or with past temporal modifiers (although they are morphologically some kind of present tense), as is the case with the French *passé composé*, which acquired this property in the XVIth century" (Caudal 2003: 9).

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

'He's gone to eat.'

c. Maria a scris o scrisoare.
Maria have-3rd pers.sg. written-past. part. a letter
'Maria has written a letter.'

Consider also the sentences below, where the resultative PC is accompanied by a Present sentence, that lays emphasis on the result of the action in the first sentence:

(5) a. A venit apa mare şi ne-a luat iar puntea, lua-o-ar ciorile! (...) N-ai pe unde trece îmbrăcat.
'The flood has come and taken the bridge away, damn it. There's no way you can cross it with your clothes on.'

b. Creştinii nu mai vor să muncească, asta-i. Şi s-au pus pe făcut sărbători.
' The Christians no longer want to work. And they have started creating holy days.'

c. Apoi vezi, nici asta nu se mai poate acum (...). Toate sărbătorile cele mari au fost prinse de alţii.
'See, you can't have that any longer. (...) All the big holy days have been taken by others.'

b) Another argument in favour of the resultative, non-preterite, non-narrative dimension of PC is the fact that this tense exhibits 'reverse order' phenomena, unless placed in an explicitly narrative context. Compare the sentences under (6) and (7), which demonstrate the opposition between the simplex and the complex past in Romanian:

(6) Ion căzu. Marin îl împinse.
'Ion fell-PS. Marin pushed him-PS'
e_1.....e_2

The example under (6) demonstrates that PS does not violate the "reverse order constraint", whereas in (7) it is obvious that PC does not obey the rule:

(7) Ion a căzut. Marin l-a împins.
Ion fell-PC. Marin pushed –PC him.
e_2.....e_1

This fully demonstrates that the Romanian *perfect simplu* behaves like a preterite, narrative tense, unlike PC, which exhibits 'temporal inversion' phenomena.

c) The third argument we are bringing in favour of the resultative, stative value of PC comes from combination with time adverbials. It has been noticed (Vişan, 1996, Crăiniceanu 1997, 2003, 2004) that PC can combine with adverbial phrases that normally do not appear in combination with other Romance perfects (*de*-phrases, for example). This brings the Romanian PC closer in meaning to its English counterpart:

i. Stative PC sentences can be coupled with *de* – phrases, resulting in the Universal value of PC:

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

(8) a. M-a iubit de mic copil.
Me-cl has loved DE little child
'He has loved me ever since he was a child.'
b. Urât mi-a fost mie de cand lumea, frate Avacume, sfântul care umblă cu şiretlicuri la ţintar.
'Brother Avacum, I have always hated a saint who cheats at board games.'

Interestingly enough, the sentences under (8) have a Present parallel, which stands in favour of the interpretation of PC as a genuine "*present* perfect".

Such examples support the fact that Romanian exhibits instances of 'continuative' perfect, although it normally prefers to use Present sentences:

(9) a. Mă iubeşte de mic copil.
me-clitic has loved-PC ever since little child.
'He has lived me since childhood.'
b. M-a minţit dintotdeauna.
me-clitic has lied-PC since always
'He has lied to me all his life.'

ii. Another such puzzling example is supplied by the combination between *accomplishment* PC forms and *de*-phrases:

(10) a. Am scris scrisoarea de trei zile.
have written-PC the letter DE three days.
'It's three days since I wrote the letter.'
b. A venit de două ore.
has come-PC DE two hours
'It's two hours since he came.'
c. Am predat lucrarea de o săptămână.
have delivered-PC the paper DE a week
'It's a week since I delivered the paper.'

The example under (10) *combines an event with a durative adverbial*. Such examples are all the more puzzling as they are banned by other Romance languages. Even more, these examples have a clearly stative counterpart in the sentences under (11), which use the Present:

(11) a. Scrisoarea e scrisă de trei zile.
the letter is written-PRES for three days
'It's three days since the letter was written.'
b. E venit de două ore.
is come-PRES for two hours
'It's two hours since he arrived.'
c. Lucrarea e predată de o săptămână.
the paper is delivered-PRES for a week
'It's one week since the paper was delivered.'

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

All the data presented above argue for treating PC sentences as stative, as expressing events resulting into states.

Taking all of the above into consideration, our proposal will look upon PC as a perfect that is 'semantically richer' than its English counterpart. Consider the diagram proposed by Kamp & Reyle (1993), which covers the stages of a complete event (i.e. accomplishment):

(12) I II III

preparatory stage — culmination point — result stage

Kamp & Reyle (1993) show that the English perfect makes visible the last phase of the diagram, i.e. the result state. The difference between the English Present Perfect and the Romanian one (and the French one, for that matter, de Swart & Moledijk 2002, Caudal 2003) is that the latter perfects make visible more than one phase of the diagram, thus appearing to be richer in meaning. This happens because the function of these two perfects (i.e. the Romanian and French one) is to locate some result stage but also some inner stage in the past. It is what makes these perfects compatible with either type of adverbial. This is why these perfects are semantically richer: they contribute a 'double time' inasmuch as they impose a double temporal constraint on the situation they describe, that of anteriority and of current relevance. Conversely, the English perfect contributes only a 'single time', focusing only on the result stage being related to speech time.

This explanation validates our treatment of PC as a 'perfect', a tense whose basic value is that of expressing *events resulting into states*. We thus lay stress on the *aspectual* dimension of this tense and on the fact that it is subject to the semantic effect of the perfect proposed under (12) by Kamp & Reyle (1993). Our proposal relies heavily of the fact that this tense is 'deictic', as opposed to the 'non-deictic' PS. The simple fact that the sentences under (2) do not have a PS equivalent pleads in favour of treating PC as stative, instead of eventive:

(13) a. ? Ion mâncă ieri la ora cinci.
Ion eat-PS yesterday at hour five
b. ? Maria plecă acum o oră.
Maria leave-PS now one hour

In both sets of examples under (1) and (2), there is a clear link with speech time. We insist therefore that PC is still a 'perfect', due to its 'deictic' character[2] that it still possesses.

[2] We agree with de Swart & Molendijk's (2003) opinion that, even if the Dutch and French present perfect are not subject to the Present Perfect Puzzle, they are nonetheless genuine Reichenbachian perfects. "However, they differ in the additional constraints imposed upon the

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

2. A HIERARCHY OF THE PERFECT

The previous section has attempted to draw attention to a few important points related to the interpretation of the Romanian complex past. Firstly, we have made a distinction between the English Present Perfect and the Romanian one, showing that the English Present Perfect is subject to the 'past-adverb' constraint, while the Romanian one is not. This means that PC is not subject to 'Present Perfect Puzzle' phenomena, to use Klein's (1992) term. Because of that PC can be integrated into the category of 'non-Present Perfect Puzzle languages' in the line of Giorgi & Pianesi (1998):

(14)

[- PRESENT PERFECT PUZZLE]	[+ PRESENT PEFECT PUZZLE]
Italian Ho mangiato alle quattro. *German* Ich bin um vier abge fahren. *Dutch* Jon is om vier aur weggegaan. *Icelandic* Jon hefur faridh klukkan fiogur. *Romanian* Ion a plecat la ora patru. *French* Jena est parti a 16 h. *Spanish* Juan ha salido a las 4.	*English* *John has left at four. *Norwegian* *Jon har dratt cokken fire. *Danish* *Jon er gaaet klokken fire. *Swedish* *Johan har slutat klockan fyra.

However, we argued that PC is still a perfect, since it has a 'deictic' dimension (it is clearly linked to speech time) and it is still used resultatively. If we were to make use of Lenci & Bertinetto's (2000) proposal, we would say that PC is definitely 'perfective', but that it evinces tendencies of turning from a 'perfect' into an 'aorist' (or preterite). Consider the diagram Lenci & Bertinetto (2000) offer for Italian:

possible relations between the past event and other times or events in the sentence, or the surrounding discourse. The English present perfect blocks all temporal and rhetorical relations. Dutch allows modification by time adverbials, but not narration. French has the most liberal present perfect, because we can use the Passé Composé to tell stories. Even the Passé Composé maintains its orientation toward S (speech time), though, and has not yet developed into a full preterit" (de Swart & Molendijk 2003: 1).

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

(15)

Italian Present and Past Tenses

IMPERFECTIVE	PERFECTIVE Event = completed, bounded entity	
Simple present (*parli*) Imperfect (*parlavi*)	**Perfect** aspect (compound) result of event lasts up to RT	**Aoristic** aspect (simple) event is totally anterior to utterance time
	1. Compound past with perfect meaning (*ho parlato*) 2. Pluperfect (*avevo parlato*) 3. Past Perfect (*ebbi parlato)*	1. Simple past (*parlasti*) 2.Compound past with aoristic meaning (*ho parlato*)

Ultimately, we placed the Romanian PC in the same slot with its French counterpart, since both tenses have a permissive combinatory capacity: they are both non-Present Perfect Puzzle languages and can both be used narratively. This suggestion can be represented in the following hierarchy:

(16) perfect preterite

English > Spanish, Catalan > Dutch > Romanian, French

We have placed the English perfect in initial position since it has been shown that this tense exhibits all the features of a genuine 'perfect': it cannot combine with definite past adverbials (such as *yesterday*) and it can never be used narratively:

(17) a. * Mary has arrived at 5.

b. * Marry has arrived and has started to cook. She then has turned on the TV…

The Spanish / Catalan perfects come next due to the fact that they are subject to what Comrie (1985) used to call 'the hodiernal restriction': a sentence like the one under (18) holds true only if a '24-hour rule' restricts the temporal distance between the event described by the sentence and 'now':

(18) a. Juan ha salido a las cinco. (Spanish)

b. En Juan ha sortit a les cinc. (Catalan)

'John has left at five.'

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

The Dutch complex past comes next, since it can be combined with definite past adverbs but it can never be used in narration (Boogaart 1999):

(19) * Toen Jan me heeft gezien (VTT) is hij bang geworden (VTT).
'When John saw me, he got frightened.'

Ultimately, we place Romanian in the same line with French, since both perfects can combine with definite past adverbials and they can be even used narratively. However, as we will see in the next section, a more fine-grained distinction between these two perfects is in order.

3. PC – A CONTEXTUALLY NARRATIVE TENSE

This section investigates the narrative use of PC, which is problematic to our analysis since it comes against the perfective (i.e. stative) analysis suggested for this tense. As stated before, the claim made by Kamp & Reyle (1993), Parsons (1990) is that *the semantic effect of the perfect is that of an event resulting into a state (e >< s)*. Thus, in their analysis, Present Perfect and any other PC are seen as introducing *states* into discourse. However, this stative value of the Romanian perfect is paralleled by a puzzling *'eventive'* one, which comes from the *tendency of this tense to become a preterite* (not only in the case of French, Romanian, but see Dutch, German – Klein 1994, Lobner 2002). Thus PC *can also be used narratively*, introducing events in succession that 'move narration forward':

Compare (20) to (21) for different PC values:

(20) Mi-ai spart capul! (PC) (resultative, stative value)
'You've cracked my skull!'

(21) Marin şi Ion au plecat de-acasă devreme şi s-au întors seara târziu. După ce au intrat în casă, au făcut de mâncare, au luat cina şi s-au culcat. Şi a doua zi urmau să se scoale de dimineaţă. (narrative, eventive value of PC)
'Marin and Ion left (PC) home very early and came back (PC) very late in the evening. After they entered (PC) the house, they fixed (PC) dinner, ate (PC) and went (PC) to bed. They had (IMP) to wake up early the next day, too.'

This situation is perfectly in accordance with the diachronical explanation offered among others by Bybee *et al.* (1994), who explain that in many languages the perfect is grammaticalized into a perfective past tense when the accent *shifts* from the resulting state to the underlying event. Evidence for this claim is provided by evolutive stages in the history of Romanian, as shown in Manoliu Manea (1993), Călăraşu (1987).

As we have already argued in the first section of this paper, this approach is supported by the fact that PC exhibits 'reverse order phenomena'. However compare the sentence under (7) to the one under (22):

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

(22) În acea zi a plouat mult. Cu toţii eram iritaţi. Maria l-a lovit din greşeală pe Mihai. *Ion a căzut. Marin l-a împins* şi a căzut şi el. (PC)
'That day it rained a lot. We were all out of sorts. Maria hit Mihai by mistake. Ion fell. Marin pushed him and then fell too.'

where the 'reverse order' phenomenon is *undone by integration in larger narrative context.* Note that no explicit time connectors are needed to force this reading upon the PC, which means that the natural temporal progress is offered by the sequence of tense forms themselves.

A similar process happens in French, as noticed by de Swart & Molendijk (2002). A noteworthy exception to the rules of written French is offered by the novel *L'Étranger* by Camus, where PC is employed as a narrative, literary tense. In Camus' novel, PC is thus consistently used to create stylistic contrast and has a decidedly marked value. De Swart & Molendijk (2002), de Swart & Corblin (2003), de Swart and Molendijk (2003) provide a SDRT account for the narrative use of PC, insisting upon the fact that this tense maintains its orientation towards S and has not developed into a full preterit. They analyse PC as contextually narrative, and demonstrate by performing a global analysis of the first chapters of Camus' novel, that the sequential relation between PC forms is created through connectors, time adverbials. Thus, PC establishes a rhetorical relation of Elaboration upon ST (seen as the Topic of the DRS) and a weaker rhetorical relation of Continuation that makes possible for this tense to be placed in a sequence. ("Continuation merely records that all the constituents of a complex SDRS connected to a constituent by a subordinating relation are siblings. It has no temporal effects", De Swart & Corblin 2003).

However, as we will see, this proposal poses some problems:

a) One of the problems with this analysis is pointed out by the authors themselves: analyzing the translation of these chapters in English and Dutch, they notice that the time adverbials and connectors used by Camus in order to create narrative progression are translated in the English/Dutch versions, although these versions make use of inherently narrative tenses that would normally render the presence of explicit adverbials and connectors useless. The solution offered to this problem is that the English / Dutch translators opted for this version *to recapture the stylistic effect of the contextually narrative tense used in the original text*. However, the Romanian translation of the passages indicated by de Swart & Molendijk 2003 yields similar results with both PC and PS: both versions are coherent even when temporal connectors/adverbials are left out. This situation argues against the implication that it is these structures that build narrative progression in a text in the absence of an inherently narrative tense:

(23) a. J'ai dit au concierge, sans me retourner vers lui: ‹‹Il y a longtemps que vous êtes là?›› *Immédiatement* il a répondu: ‹‹Cinq ans›› – comme s'il avait attendu depuis toujours ma demande. *Ensuite* il a beaucoup bavardé. On l'aurait bien étonné en lui disant qu'il finirait concierge à l'asile de Marengo.

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

Il avait soixante-quatre ans et il était parisien. *A ce moment* je l'ai interrompu: ‹‹Ah! Vous n'êtes pas d'ici?›› *Puis* je me suis souvenu qu'avant de me conduire chez le directeur, il m'avait parlé de maman. (quoted in de Swart & Molendijk 2003)

Without turning around, I said (PC) to the caretaker. 'Have you been here long?' Straight away he answered (PC), 'Five years' – as if he'd been waiting (PQP) for me to ask all the time. After that he chatted (PC) a lot. He'd have been surprised if anyone had told him he'd end up as the caretaker of the Marengo home. He was (IMP) sixty-four and he came (IMP) from Paris. At that point I interrupted (PC) him. 'Oh, you're not from round here?' Then I remembered (PC) that he'd talked to me about mother.

b. Îi spusei (PS) portarului, fără să mă întorc spre el: "Sunteţi de multă vreme aici?" Îmi răspunse (PS) : "De cinci ani" – de parcă se aştepta de mult să-i pun întrebarea. Vorbi (PC) vrute şi nevrute. Ar fi fost surprins dacă cineva i-ar fi spus că va sfârşi ca portar la azilul Marengo. Avea şaizeci şi patru de ani şi era din Paris. Îl întrerupsei (PS): "Deci nu sunteţi de pe-aici?" Îmi amintii (PS) că discutasem cu el despre mama.

c. I-am spus (PC) portarului, fără să mă întorc spre el: "Sunteţi de multă vreme aici?" Mi-a răspuns (PC): "De cinci ani" – de parcă se aştepta de mult să-i pun întrebarea. A vorbit vrute şi nevrute (PC). Ar fi fost surprins dacă cineva i-ar fi spus că va sfârşi ca portar la azilul Marengo. Avea şaizeci şi patru de ani şi era din Paris. L-am întrerupt: "Deci nu sunteţi de pe-aici?" Mi-am amintit (PC) că discutasem cu el despre mama.

b) A second problem is posed by the variety of examples offered by Romanian. While in certain pieces of text we encounter 'well-behaved instances of PC', which are easily perceived as elaboration examples (in this case PC appears as a perspective shifter and can be interpreted as deictic or evokative, and is frequently used in the Ist person), other instances are clearly narrative, easily reformulated by means of PS. Consider the examples below:

(24) 'deictic' use

a. Când sosi (PS) Alexandru-vodă, sfânta slujbă începuse (PS) şi boierii erau toţi adunaţi.

După ce a ascultat (PC) sfânta slujbă, s-a coborât (PC) din strană, s-a închinat (PC) pe la icoane, şi apropiindu-se de racla sf. Ioan cel nou, s-a plecat (PC) cu mare smerenie şi a sărutat (PC) moaştele sfântului. *Spun* (Present) că în minutul acela el era foarte galben la faţă şi că racla sfântului ar fi tresărit.

După aceasta, suindu-se iarăşi în strană, se întoarnă (PS) către boieri şi zise…

(C. Negruzzi, *Alexandru Lăpuşneanul*)

b. Întâmplarea pe care vreau (Present) s-o povestesc e adevărată şi ar putea sluji poate celor ce adună documente pentru psihologia mulţimii.

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

Locuiesc (Present) într-un oraş paşnic, în care evenimentele cele mai însemnate sunt alegerile, un bal în timpul iernii pentru ajutorarea săracilor şi schimbarea guvernului (…).

În acest orăşel adormit, s-a petrecut (PC) un fapt extraordinar: o crimă, în condiţii deosebite. (M. Sadoveanu, *Panica*) – story goes on with PC forms.

c. Am primit (PC) *într-o duminică* după-amiaza vizita unui tânăr care voia să mă cunoască. Fusese (MMCP) unul din cei mai valoroşi elevi ai defunctului tatăl meu… (T. Arghezi, *Omul care nu ştie să plece*) – narration continues with PS.

(25) elaboration on 'then', 'flashback' PC (where the main story is told by means of PS)

Odată, să fi avut atunci nu mai mult de trei ani (…), a sfârşit (PC) prin a se arunca de pe buza patului direct cu capul în jos în lada de lemne. (M. Preda, *Marele singuratic*) – paragraph goes on with PC. Main story line is done with PS.

Compare these examples to the ones below, where we notice a 'sloppy' concatenation of PC forms with PS ones (when they are supposed to be in complementary distribution). The relation is clearly one of succession, not of elaboration. Both PC and PS appear sometimes in the same passage with a similar value (although they normally are in complementary distribution). Compare (26) where narrative PS cannot be followed by a PC with a similar value to the next ones under (27) where both tenses are brought together in a striking combination:

(26) *Merse (PS) la şcoală şi a primit (PC) nota zece pentru compunere.

'He went to school and got an A for his essay.'

(27) a. Vorbind aşa, au ajuns (PC) aproape de Tecuci, unde poposiră la o dumbravă. (C. Negruzzi, 19th century)

'Thus speaking they got (PC) close to Tecuci, where they stopped (PS) in a glen.'

b. Imediat ce termină povestirea se simţi (PS) prost, era ceva făcut în istorisirea sa, prea indirect şi prea simbolic, o pretenţie şi o falsitate care îl jigni (PS), şi tăcu (PS) foarte jenat. Poate ar mai fi regretat dacă n-ar fi fost reacţia celorlalţi, după tăcerea penibilă. Andrei, primul, apoi aproape toţi, unul după altul, au venit (PC) la el, l-au atins (PC) fals afectuos pe umeri, spunând "lasă, bine că a trecut. Să nu ne mai gândim la asta niciodată. Să nu mai vorbeşti. Important e să fii sănătos, să-ţi vezi de treabă şi să uiţi, mai ales să uiţi." Se străduiau să alunge impresia produsă de povestirea lui, se păzeau de ea şi tot Andrei fu (PS) singurul care dădu glas şi unui gând mai larg explicativ: "E bine că ai povestit. Dar noi toţi ne-am închipuit, am ştiut toate acestea, nu trebuie să le mai repeţi, măcar în faţa noastră. Iulia este altceva, ea te-a pus, ei i-ai povestit, poate că pe ea o interesează. Noi ştim chiar dacă n-am auzit."

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

Atunci Iulia izbucni (PS) în râs, din nou râsul ei gâlgâit, înalt ca şi vocea ei, prea tare şi jignitor pentru ceilalţi din cameră. Apoi îi spuse (PS): "dacă pe ei nu-i interesează, pe mine, mărturisesc, da. Ţi-am spus, am cunoscut copia, vreau să cunosc şi modelul. Dar, ca să nu abuzăm de răbdarea lor, hai cu mine la o scurtă plimbare, am maşina în faţă şi-mi vei povesti nu cum a fost, ci cum ai ajuns acolo."

Nu s-a împotrivit (PC) şi a urmat-o (PC), scuzându-se vag, s-au suit (PC) într-o mică maşină parcată în faţa casei şi au pornit. Nu-i plăcea cum conducea Iulia (…). Au ieşit (PC) astfel în afară de oraş, apoi s-au oprit (PC) într-un loc departe de orice sat, înainte de serpentinele ce treceau într-o altă vale, şi din nou, fără nici o introducere i-a cerut (PC): "Povesteşte!"

Dar impresia lăsată de masa de familie, de prudenţa închisă a lui Andrei şi de foiala celorlalţi nu-l părăsise, era mai importantă chiar decât prezenţa ciudată a acestei femei, de aceea începu (PS) poate chiar cu începutul, aparent fără legătură cu cele întrebate. Însă Iulia îl lăsă (PS) în pace, nu-l întrerupse (PS) ca să-i atragă atenţia că nu această povestire o voia. Putu să vorbească nestingherit şi cu folos pentru el până la capăt… (Al. Ivasiuc, *Păsările*, end of chapter I, chapter starts with PS)

c. Chiriac se târî (PS) până sus. Fusese atins de alice în pulpa dreaptă, mai sus de şold. Rana nu era adâncă şi putea merge singur, fără sprijin.

− Să nu spui cine-a fost, auzi? Să nu spui! Îmi ceru (PS) el cu glas subţire, care parcă nu mai era al lui.

Şi l-am ascultat (PC), fără să ştiu de ce-o făceam.

Ţigăncile i-au oblojit rana (PC), bocind şi ocărând. Rudarii înjurau de ţi se încrâncena carnea. Singur mecanicul nu zise (PS) nimic: se uită (PS) la vânzoleala din colibă şi plecă (PS) fluierând spre coliba lui, săpată lângă pompă. (F. Neagu, *În văpaia lunii*)

d. Eu, dar mai ales Mitrea, îi întreţinuserăm iluziile până când s-a desprimăvărat (PC, e_1), când foştii locatari reveniră (PS, e_2) la vechiul sediu, iar Maria Baicului adusese (MMCP, e_3) noutăţi despre isprăvile lui Sterian, fapt care mă cutremurase. (A. Buzura, *Feţele tăcerii*)

'I, and especially Mitrea, tried to keep his illusions intact until spring *came* (PC), when the old tenants *came back* (PS) to the old building, and Maria Baicu *brought* (MMCP) news about Sterian, which terrified me.'

Our analysis of Romanian texts reveals that: *PC is frequently used in both spoken and written Romanian* and the *narrative value of PC alternates with the narrative PS* without necessarily imposing a shift of perspective. While we agree that PC is still a perfect and hence not inherently narrative, the data offered by Romanian prove that in narrative contexts the switch from PS to PC is almost imperceptible in many cases, which pleads in favour of a similar treatment of these tenses in narration.

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

If, according to Vet (1992, 1999), the French PC is half-way on the 'preterite road', *Romanian PC appears to be even more advanced towards becoming a preterite than its French counterpart*. The frequency of contexts where PC is used narratively gives us reason to believe that PC's tendency to become a 'perfective past' (Vet 1999) is much stronger in the case of Romanian. This means that solutions such as the one offered in de Swart & Corblin (2002), de Swart & Molendijk (2002, 2003) do not answer all the problems posed by the Romanian PC. Consequently, a reformulation of the hypothesis under (16) is in order:

(28) perfect preterite

English > Spanish, Catalan > Dutch > French > Romanian

In order to provide an answer to the two questions we introduced in this paper, related to a DRT integration of the narrative use of IMP and PC (seen as aspectually sensitive, stative tenses) we will have to remember Smith's (2000) analysis of discourse modes.

Smith (2000, 2002, 2003) chooses to discuss passages instead of genres, as a more local level of analysis. She motivates this choice by explaining that covert linguistic categories in discourse, i.e. aspectual situation categories such as event and state pattern together to establish discourse units at a relatively local level of the passage. In her opinion, the genre is the wrong level for close linguistic study of discourse, due to its strong pragmatic basis.

Let us remember the classification of discourse modes:

a. *temporal discourse modes:* narrative, report, description
b. *atemporal discourse modes*: informative, argument- commentary

Thus Smith (2000) establishes that we can identify the following entities at the level of the passage:

(29) *Entities*

a) eventualities: temporally located

- Situations

Events: Mary won the race. John opened the door. Lee rehearsed.
States: The cat is on the table. Sam is tired. Mary likes icecream.

- Stative (general)

The lion has a bushy tail. (generic)
John often fed the cats last year. (generalizing-habitual)

b) Abstract entities: not temporally located

- Facts: object of knowledge
  a. I know that Mary refused the offer.
  b. Mary's refusal of the offer was significant.
- Propositions: objects of belief
  a. I believe that Mary refused the offer.
  b. Mary's refusing of the offer was unlikely.
- Projective Propositions: unrealized

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

a. Mary wants to go to Bangkok.
b. They asked him to go to Bangkok.
c. We commanded him to go to Bangkok.

Different types of entities predominate in passages of different modes:

(30) *Temporal modes*
Narrative – events, states;
Report – events, states, eventives;
Description – states, statives, ongoing events.
Atemporal modes
Informative – facts, statives;
Argument – abstract entities, statives.

In the temporally organized modes, a text advances as location changes – time or space. The text modes of Argument and Information are not temporally organized, though they may include eventualities that are temporally located. The basic case of narrative is sequence.

There are two principles for tense interpretation in the narrative mode. If a sentence expresses a bounded event, RT advances. If the eventuality is not a bounded event, RT does not change and tense is anaphoric. The two patterns are set out in (31):

(31) a. Continuity pattern, narrative advancement: bounded events
e_1…….e_2……e_3
RT< SpT RT2> RT1 RT3 > RT2
b. Anaphoric pattern, simultaneous with preceding RT: states, progressives
e_3…….s_1……
RT1 RT2 = RT1

Tense conveys continuity, anaphora or deixis. Consequently, each discourse mode has a slightly different pattern:

(32) Patterns of tense interpretation in the temporal discourse modes:
Continuity: non-first clause, bounded events, narrative mode;
Anaphora: non-first clause, unbounded events and states, narrative mode;
non-first clause, all eventualities, descriptive mode.

A solution to the questions we have formulated can be offered by corroborating Smith's (2000) analysis of discourse modes with de Swart's (1998) theory. A unification of these two lines of analysis enables us to draw the following conclusion:

Mutatis mutandis, *the structure of the passage* is offered the interpretation under (33):

(33) [Mode [Tense [Aspect [eventuality description]]]

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

where Mode assumes the value of a genuine 'Discourse Operator'[3] and predicts the eventualities that will be introduced in the passage. Metaphorically, discourse modes appear aspectually sensitive themselves, in the sense that their semantics imposes the presence of a certain type of eventuality. In case the eventuality type is not the desired input, the combination between this eventuality type and the pattern of temporal interpretation imposed by the respective discourse mode generates conflict, tension. This semantic clash makes the respective eventualities be 'coerced' into changing their aspectual dimension and observe the pattern dictated by the Mode in whose scope they are.

Consequently, a passage containing a 'narrative PC' is solved by an aspectual shift (e><s turned into event) of the eventualities introduced. In the case of the Narrative Mode, which imposes sequential order and dynamism, the perfect forms *will no longer introduce states into the discourse, but events that will observe the continuity principle*. In other words, the PC operator no longer appears as aspectually sensitive (see de Swart 1998 for more details on this term), its aspectual sensitivity has been *neutralized*, overriden by the aspectual sensitivity of the higher operator in the structure. Thus, the wide scope of the mode operator *may undo the semantic effect of the perfect* and allow for a purely eventive, sequential interpretation:

(34) a. the default case: the PC is a 'perfect' tense, establishing a link to speech time (The PC form(s) appearing in the (narrative) piece of discourse are insertions of the author and perform 'elaboration' on the 'now' of the author):

[Narrative [PRES [PERF [quantized event]]]]

b. the marked case: the PC is turned into a Past Tense, a preterite, interchangeable with PS; the perfect value (that of the result state) is lost:

PC: [Narrative [Cse [PRES [PERF [quantized event]]]]]

The notation Cse stands here for 'coercion of state into an event', as proposed by de Swart (1998). This notation shows that a phenomenon of reinterpretation has taken place: the type-shifting is in this case dictated by the discourse mode (narration presupposes a sequence of events, consequently PC forms placed in sequence become eventive in meaning).

[3] This proposal having to do with the semantics of a narrative discourse is supported by the syntactical model adopted in Vişan (2006). We propose that the narrative discourse operator should replace the deictic operator placed under C^0. This idea comes in agreement with Guéron's (2002) own proposal with respect to the 'historical' use of the present. Thus, for an example like the one under (1):

(1) The hero enters his living room. He picks up a book. He reads it. Then…

"The T projection should function like a [-definite] pronoun, like a variable which has to be bound by an operator under C. […] This operator is a narrative one which makes a link between all the sentences present in a discourse." (Guéron 2002: 106)

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

Our analysis has the merit of integrating problematic tense values into the theory: it attempts to offer a consistent explanation to the narrative uses PC (in French and Romanian), and correctly predicts the stylistic effects gained by the use of these tenses in narration.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The Romanian complex past is analysed as an aspectually sensitive tense, introducing events resulting into states into the discourse.

Our DR analysis for the Romanian PC relies on the premise that it is a 'perfect', therefore stative in its basic meaning, but a 'perfect' fast turning into a preterite. We analyse this tense as contextually narrative, in opposition to PS, which is inherently narrative. A classification of discourse modes helps us out of the dilemma. A discourse operator (of the type 'Narrative') allows for PC to be used in narration. In this case the semantic effect of the perfect is undone, and PC becomes eventive (by means of an operation of coercion).

REFERENCES

Bogaart, R., 1999, *Aspect and Temporal Ordering,* Holland Academic Graphics.

Bybee, J., R. Perkins and W. Pagliuca, 1994, *The Evolution of Grammar,* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Caudal, P. and C. Vetters, 2002, "Que l'imparfait n'est pas (encore) un preterit", to appear in P. Larivee and I. Labeau (eds) *Nouveaux développements de l'imparfait,* New York/Amsterdam, Rodopi.

Caudal, P., 2003, "The English Perfect and the Semantic-Pragmatics Interface", LLF, UMR 7110, CNRS & U. Paris 7, (paper presented at the Annual Conference of the English Department, University of Bucharest).

Călăraşu, C., 1987, *Timp, mod, aspect în limba română în secolele al XVI-lea–al XVIII-lea*, Bucureşti, TUB.

Comrie, B., 1985, "Aspect and Voice: Some Reflections on Perfect and Passive", in Tedeschi and Zaenen (eds.), 65−78.

Crăiniceanu, I., 1997, *The Category of Aspect in English and Romanian with Special Reference to the Progressive Aspect*, Craiova, Universitatea din Craiova, Facultatea de limbi şi istorie.

Crăiniceanu, I., 2003, "Variations on Two Themes: the Romanian *Perfect Compus* and the English *Present Perfect*", *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics,* vol. V, nr. 2.

Crăiniceanu, I., 2004, *The Under-specificity of Romanian Perfect Compus and Its English Equivalents* (ms.), 'Spiru Haret' University, Bucharest.

Densuşianu, O., 1997, *Histoire de la langue roumaine*, Bucureşti, Editura Grai şi suflet.

Detges, U., 2004, "How Cognitive is Grammaticalization? The History of the Catalan *Perfect Perifrastic*", in O. Fischer, M. Norde and H. Perridon (eds)**,** *Up and down the Cline – The Nature of Grammaticalization,* Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 211−227.

Fenn, P., 1987, *A Semantic and Pragmatic of the English Perfect*, Tubingen, Gunter Narr Verlag.

Giorgi, A. and F. Pianesi, 1998, *Tense and Aspect. From Semantics to Morphosyntax*, Oxford University Press.

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

Giorgi, A. & F. Pianesi, 2002, "Sequence of Tense and the Speaker's Point of View from the Imperfect", *Working Papers in Linguistics,* 12*,* University of Venice.
Gramatica limbii române, 1966, vol. I, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei.
Graur, Al., 1968, *Tendinţele actuale ale limbii române*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică.
Guéron, J., 2002, "Sur la Syntaxe de l'aspect", in B. Laca (ed.), *Temps et aspect. De la morphologie à l'interprétation*, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.
Harris, M., 1982, "The 'Past Simple' and the 'Present Perfect' in Romance", in: Vincent and Harris (eds), 42−70.
Iordan, I., V. Guţu, A. Niculescu, 1967, *Structura morfologică a limbii române contemporane*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică.
Istoria limbii române, 1965, 1969, Vol. 1, 2, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei.
Jespersen, O., 1931, *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, Part IV, London and Copenhagen.
Kamp, H. and U. Reyle, 1993, *From Discourse to Logic,* Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Klein, W., 1992, "The Present Perfect Puzzle", *Language*, volume 68, Number 3.
Lenci, A. and P. M. Bertinetto, 2000, "Aspect, Adverbs and Events", in: J. Higginbotham, F. Pianesi, A.C. Varzi (eds), *Speaking of Events*, Oxford University Press.
Lobner, S., 2002, "Is the German Perfekt a Perfect Perfect?", in: G. Katz, S. Reinhart and Ph. Reuter (eds), *Sinn & Bedeutung VI. Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Gesellschaft fur Semantik,* University of Osnabruck.
Manoliu-Manea, M., 1993, "Valori narative ale timpurilor trecute în cronicile moldoveneşti", in *Gramatică, pragmasemantică şi discurs*, Bucureşti, Editura Litera.
Parsons, T., 1990, "Events in the Semantics of English. A Study", in *Subatomic Semantics*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Reichenbach, H., 1947, *Elements of Symbolic Logic*, New York, The Free Press.
Rigau, G., 2001, "The Role of Quantifier *Tot* in some Catalan Temporal Phrases" (ms.), Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona.
Schwegler, A., 1990, *Analyticity and Syntheticity. A Diachronic Perspective with Special Reference to Romance Languages*, Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
Schmitt, C., 2001, "Cross-Linguistic Variation and the Present Perfect: the Case of Portuguese", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory,* 19, 403−453.
Smith, C., 2000, "The Domain of Tense", in: J. Gueron, & J. Lacarme (eds), *The Syntax of Time*, MIT Press, Presented at International Round Table "The Syntax of Tense and Aspect", Paris.
Smith, C., 2003, *Modes of Discourse*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
de Swart, H., 1998, "Aspect Shift and Coercion", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory,* 16, 347−385
de Swart, H., 2000, "Tense, Aspect and Coercion in a Cross-Linguistic Perspective", in: Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King (eds), *Proceedings of the BFGOO Conference Workshops*, CSLI Publications.
de Swart, H. & A. Molendijk, 2002, "Le passé composé narratif: une analyse discursive de l'*Étranger* de Camus", in : B. Laca (ed.), *Temps et aspect. De la morphologie à l'interprétation*., Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.
de Swart, H. & F. Corblin (eds), 2003, *Handbook of French Semantics* (ms.), NOW-CNRS PICS Project, Center for the Study of Language and Information.
Vet , Co., 1992, "Le passé composé: contextes d'emploi et interprétation", *Cahiers de praxématique,* 19.
Vişan, N., 1996, *The Perfect Aspect in English and Romanian – a Discourse Representation Theory Analysis* (ms.), University of Bucharest.
Vişan, N., 2000, "Perfect Sentences – A DRT Analysis", *Studii şi cercetări lingvisitice*, 1−2, 2000, LI.
Vişan, N., 2003, "A DRT Analysis of the Romanian Perfect", *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, vol. V, 1.

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)

Vişan, N., 2006, *A DRT Analysis of the Perfect in English and Romanian*, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Received March 2006

BDD-A262 © 2006 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 17:56:16 UTC)