Tense agreement as a marked option in Romanian indirect speech: Exploration and contrast with English based on (translations of) Agatha Christie's short stories*

SHINGO SUZUKI
Tokyo Ongaku Daigaku (Tokyo College of Music)
suzuki_shingo@tokyo-ondai.ac.jp

Keywords: sequence of tenses, indirect speech, complement clause, unmarked/marked option, grammaticalization
Cuvinte-cheie: concordanţa timpurilor, vorbire indirectă, propoziţie completivă, opţiune nemarcată/marcată, gramaticalizare

1. INTRODUCTION

In Romanian, indirect speech makes optional, not obligatory, use of the agreement of verbal tenses, that is, what is called the "sequence of tenses" (= SOT). Thus, in Romanian, unlike in English, which has an obligatory SOT rule, even if the reporting verb is in the past, the tense of the original utterance can remain unchanged without being backshifted in indirect speech. Hence, this paper seeks to explore the types of features that can be observed in the presence vs. the absence of this agreement of tenses in Romanian, with the aim of providing insight into such differences, based on text translated from English into Romanian. As far as I know, this is the first attempt at this kind of exploration within text translated into Romanian in the literature.

Initially, I highlight, as a marked option, the presence of this type of agreement in Romanian indirect speech by contrasting it to English (§ 2). Thereafter, by considering several distinct variations, I explain the Romanian periphrastic forms of the Future[1] and the future-in-the-past (§ 3). Subsequently, by using the Romanian version (= RV), translated from English, of some Agatha

* This work, which constitutes a revised version of Suzuki (2018), was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP15K02482, JP18H00667. I would like to thank both Anton Mihai Popa for helping me write this English version and Editage (www.editage.com) for English language editing.

[1] I use the uppercase letter at the beginning of the terms of verb tenses (and moods) such as *Future* here, whereas the general concepts of time are in lower case, as can be seen by the word *past* in the middle of the second sentence from the beginning of this section; in this respect, consider, for example, that Romanian has the Compound Past, the Imperfect, and so on, as the tenses which denote the past. With regard to the lowercase letter *f* used in *future-in-the-past* at the end of the current sentence in the text, this depends on the fact that the periphrases of this sort are not fully incorporated, if at all, into the tense system in Romanian (see § 3).

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

Christie short stories within the Parallel corpus (2018) created as a part of joint research funded by a KAKENHI Grant (see footnote * below), I analyze several verbal tenses in subordinate clauses within indirect speech when the reporting verbs are in the past tense (§ 4). Thereafter, I evaluate how these tenses correspond to their counterparts in the original English version (= EV) by utilizing concrete numerical values. Finally, I examine to what extent the tenses are influenced by the English SOT rule (§ 5).

2. VERB TENSES IN REPORTED SPEECH IN ROMANIAN

English and the Western Romance languages (including Italian) generally have syntactical restriction of tenses, that is, they follow the SOT rule. For example, Comrie reports the basic SOT concept in English, starting with the following rule as a "preliminary version":

Quot. 1: If the tense of the verb of reporting is non-past, then the tense of the original utterance is retained; if the tense of the verb of reporting is past, then the tense of the original utterance is backshifted into the past (Comrie, 1986, p. 279).

The latter part of this rule, "if the tense of the verb of reporting is past, then the tense of the original utterance is backshifted into the past" (loc. cit.) can be confirmed by examining Comrie's example below (I indicate in bold the verb whose tense is at issue within each example sentence; in (1), for instance, the boldface is mine).

(1) *Andrew said that he **was** sick (although he now claims to be better)* (Comrie, 1986, p. 278).

We can assume that Andrew's original expression reported through indirect speech in example (1) was "I **am** sick" or similar. Since the original tense of *am* is Present, Andrew's illness will have been simultaneous, even if only partially, with his utterance. Hence, in English indirect speech, if the verb of the matrix clause is in the past tense (*said* in (1)), the Present in the original utterance is replaced by the Simple Past (bold in (1)).[2]

If the reporting verb is in the past, regardless of whether the timing of the event reported through indirect speech is anterior or posterior, the tense of the original utterance is backshifted into the past, in the same way as it is in simultaneity in (1):

[2] In (1), the pronoun *I* enunciated from the deictic center of the original speaker, *Andrew*, is replaced with another pronoun *he* from the viewpoint of the person who reports Andrew's words. I do not discuss these kinds of replacements of pronouns and adverbs (e.g., *tomorrow* of the original utterance which is replaced by *today* in (2)), because there is no significant difference in Romanian (see Vântu, 2008, pp. 865–866).

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

(2) *Yesterday, Beryl said to Charles that he **had kissed** her the day before yesterday, and that she **would kiss** him today* (Comrie, 1986, p. 266).

In (2), the verbs in bold are in the Past Perfect (*had kissed*) and in the periphrasis with the preterite form of a modal auxiliary verb (*would kiss*), whose original utterances are in typical cases "you **kissed** me yesterday" and "I **will kiss** you tomorrow," respectively. Based on these observations, we note that, in English, when the matrix clause in indirect speech is in the past, the Simple Past indicating anteriority is replaced by the Past Perfect, while the Future indicating posteriority is replaced by the periphrasis with the preterite of a modal.[3] As Comrie mentions, the original tense of the reported utterance is backshifted into the past.

In contrast, in Romanian indirect speech, backshifting into the past as Comrie says, is not essential. For example, we could say that the following Romanian sentences (3) and (4) correspond to English (1) and (2):[4]

(3) *Andrew a spus* [PC] *că **este*** [PRES] *bolnav (deşi acum pretinde că este mai bine).*
'Andrew said that he **was** sick (although he now claims to be better)' (= (1)).

(4) *Ieri, Beryl i-a spus* [PC] *lui Charles că el **a sărutat**-o* [PC] *alaltăieri, şi că ea îl **va săruta*** [FUT] *azi.*
'Yesterday, Beryl said to Charles that he **had kissed** her the day before yesterday, and that she **would kiss** him today' (= (2)).

Although the verbs in the main clause are all in the Compound Past (*a spus*), the verbs in the reported clause remain unchanged: in the Present (*este* in (3)) if it is simultaneous with the tense of the main clause, the Compound Past (*a sărutat* in (4)) if it is anterior, and the Future (*va săruta* in (4)) if it is posterior. Thus, unlike English, Romanian indirect speech uses the same tense as direct speech, without any shift. This means that a reporting speaker chooses the tense based on the viewpoint of the original speaker, apart from his/her own viewpoint. In other words, the tense of the original utterance can be used anaphorically, as opposed to deictically, with a reference point on the reporting verb in the matrix clause. Zafiu explains these characteristics of Romanian as follows (in the quotation, the numbers of example sentences are changed according to the order in the current paper)[5]:

[3] However, the replacements listed here are only basic. See Comrie (1986, pp. 267–268) to comprehend that direct and indirect speech do not necessarily correspond one-to-one.

[4] Abbreviations indicating verb tenses in Romanian (and French) example sentences in the Indicative mood include: FUT (Future), IMP (Imperfect), PC (Compound Past, Fr.: *passé composé*), PQP (Pluperfect, Fr.: *plus-que-parfait*), PRES (Present), PS (Simple Past, Fr.: *passé simple*); for other moods, C. (Conditional), or S. (Subjunctive) preceding the tense abbreviation: e.g., C.PRES (Present Conditional), and S.PRES (Present Subjunctive). Furthermore, Romanian has periphrastic verb forms indicating the "future viewed from the past" (see § 3), which are marked as FP (future-in-the-past) in this paper.

[5] The following abbreviations are used in the glosses for example sentences, including Zafiu's examples (see also footnote 4): AUX (auxiliary verb), CL (clitic), DAT (dative), INF (Infinitive), PL (plural), SG (singular).

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

Quot. 2: In Romanian, verbal tenses in subordinate clauses are used as relative, not as deictic tenses: their temporal interpretation relates to the reference point in the matrix clause, not directly to the moment of utterance.
That is why temporal forms in reported speech may remain the same as those in direct speech, only with a difference in meaning.
Thus, the present tense shows partial simultaneity with the events in the matrix clause (5a); the future tense (5b) or the present tense with future meaning (5c) shows posteriority, and the compound perfect shows anteriority with respect to the time of the matrix clause (5d):

(5) a. *Mi-a spus că* ***e*** *supărat*
CL.DAT.1SG-has told that is angry
'He told me that he was angry'

b. *Andrei mi-a spus că* ***va pleca*** *la Braşov*
Andrei CL.DAT.1SG-has told that AUX.FUT.3SG leave.INF to Braşov
'Andrei told me that he would leave for Braşov'

c. *Andrei mi-a spus că* ***pleacă*** *la Braşov*
Andrei CL.DAT.1SG-has told that leaves to Braşov
'Andrei told me that he would leave for Braşov'

d. *Mi-a spus că* ***a lipsit*** *o lună*
CL.DAT.1SG-has told that has been away a month
'(S)he told me that he had been away for a month'

This type of construction does not allow inferences about the external deictic system, that is, about the situation in the moment of utterance: (5a) does not imply 'he is still angry' (Zafiu, 2013, p. 63).

At the end of her analysis, Zafiu mentions that "[t]his type of construction does not allow inferences about the external deictic system" (loc. cit.). This is because the tense, seen from the original speaker's deictic center, has not been shifted to the external point of view, that is, to the reporting speaker's point of view. Note that Andrew's health condition expressed in the Present (*este* in bold) in (3) is different from his condition in the moment of utterance of (3).

Additionally, Zafiu continues immediately after quot. 2:

Quot. 3: Thus, the unmarked option is to use deictic tenses as anaphors, related to the internal reference frame […]; the option for specific relative tenses (the imperfect, the future in the past, the pluperfect) is possible, but this is the marked option, which presupposes a supplementary reference to the moment of utterance or to another reference point:

(6) a. *Mi-a spus* [PC] *că* ***era*** [IMP] *supărat*
'He told me that he was upset'

b. *Mi-a spus* [PC] *că* ***avea să plece*** [FP] *la Braşov*
'He told me that was going to leave for Braşov'

c. *Mi-a spus* [PC] *că* ***lipsise*** [PQP] *o lună*
'He told me that he had been away for a month'

From example (6a) it can be inferred that 'he is not upset anymore'. The pluperfect in example (6c) is ambiguous, because the implicit reference point of the pluperfect is not necessarily the present tense of the internal frame (Zafiu, 2013, pp. 63–64).

According to Zafiu, the options of Present, Future, and Compound Past in each example sentence in (5), using "deictic tenses as anaphors" (ibid., p. 63), are

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

merely unmarked. In fact, we have another set of options for Romanian, that is, the "specific relative tenses (the imperfect, the future in the past, the pluperfect)" (loc. cit.)[6]. In this latter case, the tense in the original utterance is shifted toward the past, giving rise to the agreement (or so-called sequence) regarding the tense. Thus, the agreement of tenses (or SOT), mandatory in English, French, and Italian, is just an option in Romanian.

3. FORMS OF THE FUTURE AND THE FUTURE-IN-THE-PAST IN ROMANIAN

Considering that the forms of the Future and the future-in-the-past in Romanian are quite different from those in the Western Romance languages, I explain these Romanian forms (see also Popescu, 2014, pp. 114–115), even though it is a slight digression from the main topic. The Future in Romanian has several periphrastic forms that compete socio-linguistically. Auxiliary verbs used in the Future are historically derived from *a vrea* 'to want' or *a avea* 'to have' (Zafiu, 2013, p. 38). 1) ***VOI* type**: the standard Future is composed of "a contracted form of *a vrea* (from 1SG: *voi, vei, va, vom, veţi, vor*) + bare Infinitive" (e.g., *voi cânta* 'I will sing,' see also (5b) in bold). We shall call this periphrastic form "*VOI* type" in this paper.[7] 2) ***O SĂ* type**: this Future type is often used colloquially and is composed of "the particle *o* + Present Subjunctive" (e.g., *o să cânt* 'I will sing'). The auxiliary particle *o* is unvaried throughout the person forms or, at most, may have the variant *or* for the 3rd person plural. We shall call this "*O SĂ* type" (*să* is the Subjunctive marker). 3) ***AM SĂ* type**: this is also a colloquial Future, composed of "the Present of *a avea* (*am, ai, are, avem, aveţi, au*) + Present Subjunctive" (e.g., *am să cânt* 'I will sing'). According to Zafiu, this *AM SĂ* type "is not fully grammaticalized: the auxiliary is not phonologically reduced (in contrast to the short forms in the compound perfect), and it partially preserves the original modal meaning of necessity" (Zafiu, 2013, p. 39).

[6] Romanian grammar has traditionally distinguished two tense groups depending on whether the point of view is collocated in only one or in more than one moment of utterance. This distinction has been named *timp absolut*/*timp relativ* 'absolute tense/relative tense' (see for example Vasiliu, 1963, p. 234 in GA, a former edition of the so-called *Academy Grammar*). Moreover, Zafiu uses the terms *deictic tense*/*anaphoric tense* in addition to the traditional terminology (regarding such a variation of terminology and its associated problems, see Manea, 2008, p. 401 in GALR, new *Academy Grammar*): "Only the indicative has a complex series of tenses. The absolute (deictic) tenses are: the present, the simple past, the compound past, and the future. The relative (anaphoric) tenses are: the imperfect, the pluperfect, and the future perfect. Absolute tenses have also certain anaphorical uses, with reference points which differ from the speech time" (Zafiu, 2013, p. 55).

[7] Furthermore, there are regional variants where the auxiliary of the *VOI* type loses the initial consonant *v* and sometimes replaces the vowel with another one (e.g., *oi cânta* might mean both 'I will sing' and 'you (2.SG) will sing'). I do not analyze these variants in this paper.

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

Unlike the Western Romance languages, Romanian does not use the Conditional to represent the "future viewed from the past."[8] Instead, two alternative forms are used to indicate posteriority exclusively in the past context. 1) ***AVEAM SĂ* type**: modeled on *AM SĂ* type Future, this *AVEAM SĂ* type is composed of "the Imperfect of *a avea* (*aveam, aveai, avea, aveam, aveaţi, aveau*) + Present Subjunctive" (7a) (see also (6b) in bold).[9] 2) ***URMA SĂ* type**: another form is created with "the Imperfect of *a urma* 'to follow' (3SG: *urma*) + Present Subjunctive" (7b). Here, *a urma* is impersonal: *urma să...* lit. '(it) followed that…' (Manea, 2008, pp. 441–442)[10]:

(7) a. ***aveam*** ***să*** ***plec*** (Zafiu, 2013, p. 40)
have.IMP.1SG SĂ leave.S.PRES.1SG
'I was going to leave'
b. ***urma*** ***să*** ***plec*** (loc. cit.)
follow.IMP.3SG SĂ leave.S.PRES.1SG
'I was about to leave'

In Quot. 3, Zafiu treats the future-in-the-past as on par with the Imperfect and the Pluperfect, as if the former is incorporated in the Romanian tense system; however, in the very same work, she states that "[t]he future in the past is an insufficiently grammaticalized periphrastic form" (Zafiu, 2013, p. 40). Timoc-Bardy goes even further and suggests the possibility of it not being grammaticalized at all:

[8] In fact, the Conditional can be used in indirect speech in Romanian; however, this happens in cases where the Conditional has an original (or developed) value as a mood, such as eventual value in conditional sentences (i) or hearsay value (ii). Nevertheless, the Romanian Conditional does not have a "future in the past" tense value.

(i) *Ştiam* [IMP] *că* ***ai pleca*** [C.PRES] *dacă* ***ai putea*** [C.PRES] (Timoc-Bardy, 2013, p. 59).
'We knew that you would have left if you could.'

(ii) *Spuneau* [IMP] *că* ***ai pleca*** [C.PRES] *în curând* (ibid., p. 60).
'They were saying that you would leave soon (I heard so, but I've not verified it).'

[9] The Romanian Subjunctive has no Imperfect or Pluperfect form, thus offering only an "unmarked" option, unlike the Indicative. In fact, in the following example, the Subjunctive is in the Present, though appearing in the past context (for the numbers enclosed in ☐ at the end of the example quotation, see footnote 18).

(i) *Mi-a spus* [PC] ***să-i scriu*** [S.PRES] (RV, p. 119).
'She told me to write [lit.: that (I) write] her' (cf. EV, p. 137). 1906

For the SOT which includes the Subjunctive in Romance languages (especially in French and Italian), see Begioni & Rocchetti (2013).

[10] However, when the subject of the verb in the Subjunctive is in the 3rd person (plural), the auxiliary *a urma* may agree with this subject. In (i) the implied subject and the auxiliary agree in the 3rd person plural:

(i) ***urmau*** ***să viziteze*** *ceea ce doreau* *să vadă* (RV, p. 141).
follow.IMP.3PL SĂ visit.S.PRES.3PL what want.IMP.3PL SĂ see.S.PRES.3PL
'They would [...] see what they wished to see' (EV, p. 162). 2313

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

Quot. 4: À la différence des « temps » verbaux composés proprement dits, l'auxiliaire de ces périphrases est bien moins (ou pas) grammaticalisé. Réservées au registre écrit soutenu, surtout littéraire, elles peuvent être considérées comme tout à fait marginales par rapport au système (Timoc-Bardy, 2013, p. 59, note 13).

"Unlike the proper compound 'tenses' of verb, the auxiliary of these periphrases is far less (or even not) grammaticalized. These periphrases, being reserved for a formal written register, especially for a literary one, can be considered quite peripheral in relation to the system".

In the present paper, I call these periphrases "future-in-the-past" dealing with them in the same way as other tenses, and as Zafiu does in Quot. 3; however, this is only in order to avoid complications when investigating tenses used in indirect speech. Nevertheless, note that these periphrases are not sufficiently grammaticalized, if at all.

4. VERB TENSES IN REPORTED SPEECH IN THE ROMANIAN VERSION FROM THE PARALLEL CORPUS (2018)

To investigate verb tenses that appear in indirect speech in the past context, I utilize our Parallel corpus (2018). The corpus contains seven languages (6 Romance languages + English) and was created with versions of the book that was originally titled *The Thirteen problems*, from the Miss Marple series by Agatha Christie (1890–1976). Initially, I limit the analysis to the RV, where I examine verbs in the Indicative past tenses[11] that govern the complement clauses[12]. More precisely,

[11] The verbs picked up from the matrix clauses are: *a afla* 'find out,' *a ameninţa* 'threaten,' *a anunţa* 'inform,' *a asigura* 'assure,' *a auzi* 'hear,' *a bănui* 'suspect,' *a confirma* 'confirm,' *a considera* 'consider,' *a se convinge* 'convince oneself,' *a crede* 'believe,' *a declara* 'declare,' *a explica* 'explain,' *a făgădui* 'promise,' *a se gândi* 'think,' *a-şi imagina* 'imagine,' *a insista* 'insist,' *a-şi închipui* 'fancy,' *a întreba* 'ask,' *a înţelege* 'understand,' *a învăţa* 'learn,' *a jura* 'swear,' *a mărturisi* 'confess,' *a nota* 'note,' *a observa* 'notice,' *a presupune* 'assume,' *a pretinde* 'assert,' *a promite* 'promise,' *a răspunde* 'answer,' *a recunoaşte* 'acknowledge,' *a regreta* 'regret,' *a reproşa* 'blame,' *a scrie* 'write,' *a simţi* 'feel,' *a spera* 'hope,' *a spune* 'say,' *a sugera* 'suggest,' *a susţine* 'claim,' *a şti* 'know,' *a se teme* 'fear,' *a vedea* 'see,' *a zice* 'say.'

[12] The term "complement clause" does not necessarily have a fixed definition (see ELR, 2001, p. 105, the entry *complemente şi propoziţii completive*). I focus here mainly on "direct object complement clause" (*propoziţie completivă directă*), however, in addition to this construction, I examine two more subordinate constructions: "subject clause" as a result of passivization (e.g., *S-a presupus că omorul a fost comis pe la şapte fără un sfert* (RV, p. 204). 'The crime would be supposed to have been committed about a quarter to seven or thereabouts' (EV, p. 234). 3564; the clitic *s-* (= *se*) is the reflexive-passive marker) and "secondary complement clause" (*propoziţie completivă secundară*, see Carabulea, 2008, p. 416) (e.g., *m-a întrebat dacă eram de acord să îl confrunt* (RV, p. 228). '[…] he said would I have any objection to confronting' (EV, p. 263). 4088; the clitic *m-* (= *mă*) 'me' is in the accusative case). In this paper, I refer to all these subordinate constructions as "complement clauses".

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

I restrict the verb tenses of these complement clauses to those in the Indicative, and I count how often the following six tenses occur: Present, Imperfect, Compound Past, Pluperfect, Future, and future-in-the-past. To count, I divide these six tenses into three pairs: «1» Present and Imperfect for the simultaneity (or posteriority), «2» Compound Past and Pluperfect for the anteriority, «3» Future and future-in-the-past for the posteriority. Interestingly, the terms in each pair are opposite to each other in terms of whether the tense remains as in the original utterance or is backshifted into the past. The following table shows the number of occurrences of the six tenses. Each opposed term within a pair is represented by the percentages in parentheses that are rounded off to one decimal place.

Table 1

Frequency of each tense in the Romanian complement clause in the past context (with or without backshifting into the past)

	Without backshifting (unmarked)		With backshifting (marked)	
«1» Simultaneity[13] Total: 125 cases	Present	46 cases (36.8%)	Imperfect	79 cases (63.2%)
«2» Anteriority Total: 89 cases	Compound Past	20 cases (22.5%)	Pluperfect	69 cases (77.5%)
«3» Posteriority Total: 34 cases	Future[14]	30 cases (88.2%)	Future-in-the-past[15]	4 cases (11.8%)

The results in the table reveal that the predicted use frequency of the unmarked form or marked form is significantly different from the actual frequency ratio (at least in «1» and «2»). In fact, the ratio of the unmarked Present (36.8%) and Compound Past (22.5%), which are likely to appear frequently due to unmarked options, is far below the ratio of the marked Imperfect (63.2%) and Pluperfect (77.5%). This problem might be solved by considering that, due to the nature of the translated version, these options are influenced by the original EV, which shows a SOT rule. Even so, if we take into consideration the case «3», we recognize that, in contrast to «1» and «2» the unmarked Future (88.2%) quantitatively exceeds the marked future-in-the-past (11.8%) significantly. This discrepancy between options, in any case, remains a question to be solved.

[13] "«1» Simultaneity" includes cases where the Present or the Imperfect indicates the posteriority.

[14] The breakdown of the 30 cases of Future is 28 for *VOI* type, 2 for *O SĂ* type, and none for *AM SĂ* type.

[15] The breakdown of the 4 cases of future-in-the-past is 2 for *AVEAM SĂ* type and 2 for *URMA SĂ* type.

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

5. HOW EACH TENSE IN COMPLEMENT CLAUSES IN THE ROMANIAN VERSION CORRESPONDS TO THE TENSE IN THE ENGLISH VERSION

To achieve clarity on the problems that emerged in the previous section, I examine how each tense in the RV in Table 1 corresponds to the tense of the original EV in the Parallel corpus (2018). My examination is based on the three pairs of tenses in the RV – «1» simultaneity, «2» anteriority, and «3» posteriority as in Table 1. However, in principle, I limit the sphere of my examination to cases in which the corresponding English verbs are in the finite form.[16] Furthermore, in the same way as the Romanian future-in-the-past (*AVEAM SĂ* type and *URMA SĂ* type), I treat the preterite forms of English modal auxiliary verbs (such as *would*, *should*) as if the periphrases with these forms were grammaticalized in the tense system, representing a "future seen from the past."

Incidentally, we already have a valuable work that contrasts the tenses of two languages: a language with a SOT rule, French, and another not necessarily, Romanian. This work, carried out by Călăraşu (1992), is based on the Romanian novel *Patul lui Procust* 'Procrustean Bed' written by Camil Petrescu (1894–1957). Călăraşu explores the kinds of replacement that take place in Indicative verb tenses during the translation from Romanian into French. However, in our survey, the original version is in English, and not in Romanian.

5.1. «1» SIMULTANEITY

First, I examine «1» simultaneity (or posteriority) in the past context, represented by the Present and the Imperfect of the RV. Table 2 below shows which tense forms of the original EV are translated into the Present and the Imperfect in the RV, and how often each replacement takes place. The table is divided into two parts: (A), where the EV tenses translated into the RV Present, and (B) comprising those translated into the RV Imperfect. In each of these parts, the frequency of the use of the EV tenses is inserted numerically in their respective cell, and the ratio of the frequency of their use is shown as a percentage of the total number of the EV tenses (96 cases).[17] If we take the EV Simple Past as an example, the ratio of its translation into the RV Present (A) (16 cases) and into the RV Imperfect (B) (57 cases) is 16.7% and 59.4%, respectively.

[16] Therefore, if the corresponding English verbs are in the non-finite form (see example (19)E in the text), or if the verbs themselves are missing (see (20)E, (21)E), I exclude these verbs from the list of use frequency. Additionally, even if the corresponding English verbs are finite, I exclude them if they do not constitute a subordinate clause (see (28)E, (29)E)), or do not appear in a past context (see (30)E).

[17] See footnote 16 for the reason why 96 cases do not add up to the total of 125 cases in «1» of Table 1.

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

Table 2

«1» Simultaneity: Original tenses in the EV translated into the Present or the Imperfect in the RV

Tense in EV	Use frequency (Total: 96 cases)	Use frequency ratio	Remarks
(A) Tenses of the finite verb in the EV translated into the **Present** in the RV (29 cases)			
Simple Past	16 cases	16.7%	including 1 case of "*was going to* + Infinitive"
Preterite of modals + inf.	6 cases	6.3%	4 cases of *could* and 2 cases of *would*
Present	4 cases	4.2%	
Past Perfect	3 cases	3.1%	
(B) Tenses of the finite verb in the EV translated into the **Imperfect** in the RV (67 cases)			
Simple Past	57 cases	59.4%	1 case of "*was going to* + Infinitive"
Preterite of modals + inf.	7 cases	7.3%	4 cases of *would*, 2 cases of *could* and 1 case of *should*
Past Perfect	3 cases	3.1%	

Regarding «1» simultaneity, examples (1) and (3) demonstrate that the Simple Past (*was* in bold) in English indirect speech can be translated into the Present (*este*) in Romanian. Furthermore, within Romanian indirect speech (5a) and (6a), not only the Present (*e*) but also the Imperfect (*era*) can be selected in the same context (apart from a difference between the unmarked and marked values). If we consider these factors, it seems most natural to predict that the Present (A) and the Imperfect (B) of the RV will be translated from the EV Simple Past. Undoubtedly, in Table 2, the Simple Past, whether it is translated into the Present (A) or the Imperfect (B), shows the highest percentages of the EV's original tenses. Moreover, the ratio of the Simple Past translated into the Imperfect (B) accounts for a majority, reaching 59.4% of the total. In addition, the ratio of its translation into the Present (A) reaches 16.7% and although the figure is considerably lower, this case is second to the former. The following are examples of translation from the EV Simple Past into the Present (8)R and the Imperfect (9)R:[18]

[18] The examples quoted from the Parallel corpus (2018) are shown in their original serial numbers in a square □. These numbers are placed at the end of each (parallel) example quotation.

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

(8) R. *Abia pe la şapte dimineaţa ne-am amintit de Elliot Haydon şi-atunci Symonds a întrebat* [PC] *unde* ***este*** [PRES] (RV, p. 41).
E. *It was not until about seven o'clock in the morning that anyone thought about Elliot Haydon, and then Symonds suddenly asked where he* ***was*** (EV, p. 44). 512
(9) R. *În schimb, a întrebat-o* [PC] *cum* ***arăta*** [IMP] *misterioasa Zarida* (RV, p. 121).
E. *Instead he asked what the mysterious Zarida* ***was*** *like* (EV, p.139). 1934

Meanwhile, although quantitatively the lowest in Table 2, the Past Perfect in the EV is translated into Present (A) or Imperfect (B) in three cases each. The following are examples from (A) and (B):

(10) R. *Poliţiştii au spus* [PC] *că nu* ***au*** [PRES] *suficiente dovezi împotriva lui* (RV, p. 235).
E. *The police said they* ***had****n't really* ***got*** *enough against him* (EV, p. 271). 4224
(11) R. *I-am răspuns* [PC] *pe un ton rece că, probabil, aşa* ***gândeau*** [IMP] *majoritatea criminalilor* (RV, p. 151).
E. *I replied drily that possibly several criminals* ***had thought*** *that in their time* (EV, p. 173). 2490

When taking the reported speech of the EV, (10)E and (11)E, and changing them from indirect into direct speech, we can assume their original utterances to be as follows: "we **have**n't really **got** enough against him" for (10)E and "several criminals **have thought** that" for (11)E. Thus, we have the verbs in the Present Perfect; that is, the Past Perfect in indirect speech of examples (10)E and (11)E is the result of tense backshifting from the Present Perfect (see the list (95) in Comrie, 1986, p. 290). In this case, the Past Perfect represents a consequence of an event that has taken place before the reference point that is fixed by the reporting verb in the main clause. Moreover, under conditions that show even a partial simultaneous relationship with the reference point in the past, it seems that the EV Past Perfect can be translated in the RV into the Present (as *au* in (10)R) or the Imperfect (as *gândeau* in (11)R). The presence of the EV Past Perfect in the lists in (A) and (B) of Table 2, although accounting for only 3.1% each, represents this kind of partial simultaneous relationship.

So far, I have dealt with the Present and the Imperfect in Romanian indirect speech only from the perspective of simultaneity, but, as already mentioned, these two tenses also represent posteriority viewed from the reference point in the past, that is, future seen from the past (see (5c)). The periphrasis with the preterite form of a modal auxiliary verb in the EV can, therefore, be translated into Present (A) and Imperfect (B) in the RV. The following is an example of the EV periphrasis of this type translated into the RV Imperfect:

(12) R. *Simţeam* [IMP] *că nu prea îl* ***lua*** [IMP] *în serios pe domnul Sanders în proaspătul său rol de văduv disperat* (RV, p. 198).
E. *I felt that he* ***would****n't* ***take*** *Mr Sanders in the rôle of the bereaved widower too seriously* (EV, p. 227). 3437

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

For the same reason, as shown in "Remarks" in Table 2, each (A) and (B) has an English periphrasis composed of "*was going to* + Infinitive," i.e., another form of "future viewed from the past." We can see one of these two examples in (13), where this form is translated into the RV Present (A):

(13) R. *Amy a zis* [PC] *că mai* ***înoată*** [PRES] *puţin* (RV, p. 145).
E. *Amy said she* ***was going to swim*** *out once more* (EV, pp. 165–166). 2373

Furthermore, Comrie refines the English SOT rule presented as the "preliminary version" in Quot. 1, into a "revised version." In Quot. 1, we have seen that "if the tense of the verb of reporting is past, then the tense of the original utterance is backshifted into the past" (Comrie, 1986, pp. 284–285), however, in the revised version he adds the caveat that "if the content of the indirect speech has continuing applicability, the backshifting is optional" (ibid., p. 285). For example, if example (1) is changed from Simple Past (*was*) to Present (*is*):

(14) *Andrew said that he* ***is*** *sick.*

Andrew's statement "that he is sick" still has to be valid in the moment of utterance of (14), therefore, (14) could not be continued by saying "although he now claims to be better," as in (1) (see Comrie, 1986, p. 285). That is to say, in English indirect speech, if the Present is used in the reported clause, its content must remain in effect in the moment of utterance. In fact, four cases of the EV Present in Table 2 have these characteristics. The following is one such example:

(15) R. *De aceea am spus* [PC] *că femeile de o anumită vârstă* ***seamănă*** [PRES] *între ele* (RV, p. 158).
E. *That's what I meant by saying that one lady of a certain age* ***looks*** *so like another* (EV, p. 180). 2629

The caveat that the backshifting into the past is optional could be confirmed by comparing the Present (15)E with the Simple Past (16)E and (17)E, all selected under the same condition:

(16) R. *n-aţi spus* [PC] *dumneavoastră că* ***este*** [PRES] *deseori prescrisă pentru bolile de inimă?* (RV, p. 223).
E. *[...] you did say that it* ***was*** *often prescribed for heart trouble?* (EV, p. 257). 4003
(17) R. *I-am răspuns* [PC] *că* ***era*** [IMP] *o întrebare dificilă, dar că, în general, nu* ***agream*** [IMP] *o astfel de soluţie. Legea* ***era*** [IMP] *lege şi* ***trebuia*** [IMP] *să i ne supunem* (RV, p. 151).
E. *I replied that that* ***was*** *rather a difficult question, but that on the whole, I* ***thought*** *not. The law* ***was*** *the law, and we* ***had*** *to abide by it* (EV, p. 173). 2485–2486

Just before (17)E is uttered, a certain woman has asked the main character: "Do you think [...] that one is ever justified in taking the law into one's own hands?"

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

(EV, p. 173) 2484. His reply in (17)E is divided into two sentences by a period. The first sentence is in indirect speech led by the reporting verb in the Simple Past (*replied*) and the conjunction (*that*), and the second is free indirect speech composed of independent clauses.[19] Among expressions containing four verbs in bold, the first two (*that* ***was*** *rather a difficult question* and *I* ***thought*** *not*) could be interpreted as personal judgments at the time of the original utterance, however, the latter two (*the law* ***was*** *the law* and *we* ***had*** *to abide by it*) are the same as in the case of medicine prescription in (16)E, that is, there is universal validity without staying in the moment of utterance. In fact, in our Parallel corpus (2018), some of the SOT languages choose the Present (without backshifting into the past) in free indirect speech, corresponding to the latter part of (17)E. For instance, the French version (= FV) has such an option:

(18) F. *Je reconnus* [PS] *que la question* ***était*** [IMP] *épineuse, mais que, tout compte fait, j'y* ***étais*** [IMP] *opposé. La loi* ***est*** [PRES] *la loi, il* ***faut*** [PRES] *la respecter* (FV, p. 153).
E. *I replied that that* ***was*** *rather a difficult question, but that on the whole, I* ***thought*** *not. The law* ***was*** *the law, and we* ***had*** *to abide by it* (EV, p. 173) (= (17)E). 2485–2486

In the Romanian context, if the content of the reported clause is still valid in the moment of utterance, the choice of the Present as in (15)R and (16)R, given its unmarked value, is definitely taken for granted. Meanwhile, even the possibility of the Imperfect would be seemingly confirmed by the free indirect speech of (17)R, the content of which has continuing applicability. This being the case, it would be suggested that the choice of the two tenses is equally optional in Romanian as it is in English. However, it is worthwhile to note Zafiu's comments about her own example (reproduced below) in Quot. 3: "From example (6a), it can be inferred that 'he is not upset anymore'" (Zafiu, 2013, p. 64):

(6) a. *Mi-a spus* [PC] *că* ***era*** [IMP] *supărat.*
'He told me that he was upset.'

This conclusion results naturally from her general assumption that the marked option "presupposes a supplementary reference to the moment of utterance" (ibid., p. 63). If this is the case, the Imperfect used in a Romanian complement clause (or independent clause in free indirect speech) makes us presuppose that its content no longer applies in the moment of utterance. Consequently, a sentence like (17)R

[19] The same holds for (17)R (for definitions of Romanian free indirect speech, see GBLR, 2010, pp. 647–648). Therefore, the two forms of the Imperfect (*era* 'was' and *trebuia* '(we) had to') that appear in the latter half of (17)R, without any reporting verb or conjunction, are not reflected in the figures in Tables 1 or 2 (B).

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

must be exceptional, and it may not be possible without the existence of the original EV in the Simple Past[20].

Finally, among the 46 cases of the Present in the RV in Table 1, the cases excluded – due to a lack of correspondence to the original EV (see footnote 16) – from the list in Table 2 (A) (46–29=17 cases) undoubtedly reflect the unmarked option in Romanian indirect speech:

(19) R. *mi-a spus că* ***vrea*** *să întocmească un nou testament* (RV, p. 79).
CL.DAT.1SG-has told that wants SĂ draw up.S.PRES.3SG a new will
E. *[Simon Clode] instructed me to draw up a new will* (EV, p. 91). 1206

(20) R. *El ne-a spus că* ***sunt*** *patru suspecţi* (RV, p. 173).
he CL.DAT.1PL-has told that are.3PL four suspects
E. *He said four suspects* (EV, p. 198). 2929

(21) R. *Richard Haydon zicea că* ***este*** *un marinar fenician* (RV, p. 35).
Richard Haydon tell.IMP.3SG that is a sailor Phoenician
E. *Richard Haydon called himself a Phoenician sailor* (EV, pp. 36–37). 376

In the original sentence (19)E, the verb form corresponding to the Present in RV is a *to* infinitive, while (20)E and (21)E lack the verb itself. It is worth noting that when the original EV has no effect on the option for specific tenses in the RV complement clause, the unmarked Present tends to be used in the case of «1» simultaneity (or posteriority) with the past context. In fact, of the 46 cases of the Present that I selected from the indirect speech in the RV (see Table 1), well over one-third of the total, in 17 (=46–29) cases (37.0%), the option is made in circumstances where it is not influenced by the original EV. Furthermore, of the 79 cases of the Imperfect in the RV, only 12 (=79–67) cases (15.2%) were voluntarily chosen in the same circumstances. This implies that when indirect speech is used spontaneously in Romanian, the unmarked Present is more likely to be chosen in the complement clause rather than the marked Imperfect, without being backshifted to the past.

5.2. «2» ANTERIORITY

This subsection examines «2» anteriority. Table 3 indicates which tenses of the original EV are translated into the RV Compound Past and the RV Pluperfect. The lists of (A) and (B) represent how often each single tense of the original EV is translated into the Compound Past and the Pluperfect, respectively.

[20] Cf. also Lungu (2008). She deduces that the Imperfect (*fierbea*) in the complement clause is odd in (i), which should express a (false) past belief about a universal truth:

(i) *(Când era mic), Mircea credea* [IMP] *că apa* ***fierbea*** [IMP] *la 90 de grade.* # IMP
'When he was little, Mircea thought that water boiled at 90° C.' (Lungu, 2008, p. 30).

She adds that "[i]n Romanian, like in Russian, apparently only the present can be used in order to convey the intended meaning" (loc. cit.).

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

Table 3

«2» Anteriority: Original tenses in the EV translated into the Compound Past or the Pluperfect in the RV

Tense in EV	Use frequency (Total: 73 cases)	Use frequency ratio	Remarks
(A) Tenses of the finite verb in the EV translated into the **Compound Past** in the RV (10 cases)			
Simple Past	6 cases	8.2%	
Past Perfect	4 cases	5.5%	
(B) Tenses of the finite verb in the EV translated into the **Pluperfect** in the RV (63 cases)			
Past Perfect	39 cases	53.4%	
Simple Past	24 cases	32.9%	

Concerning «2» anteriority in indirect speech, as indicated with the first verb in bold in each of the examples (2) and (4), the English Past Perfect (*had kissed*) can be translated into the Romanian Compound Past (*a sărutat*). Furthermore, in Romanian, as in (5d) and (6c), not only the Compound Past (*a lipsit*) but also the Pluperfect (*lipsise*) can be selected. Based on these facts, it is possible to predict that the Compound Past (A) and the Pluperfect (B) of the RV have been translated from the EV Past Perfect. And indeed, the prediction holds true as far as the percentage of the EV Past Perfect in the list (B) is concerned, since this percentage is in the majority, amounting to 53.4% of all 73 cases in Table 3. Nevertheless, within the same list (B), the percentage of the EV Simple Past is also quite high, with a 32.9% probability of being translated into the RV Pluperfect. Further, shifting focus to the list (A), the number of sentences translated into the RV Compound Past is not significantly large, counting only 10 out of 73 cases. Among these 10 cases, we find only 4 in the EV Past Perfect, which accounts for 5.5% of the total in Table 3. Compared to these numbers, 6 cases of the EV Simple Past proves to be more common with the ratio of 8.2%.

This possibility of choosing between the two tenses, Simple Past and Past Perfect, in English indirect speech is described by Comrie as follows (the example number in Quot. 5 is matched with the serial number of this paper):

Quot. 5: Corresponding to the direct speech of (22), there are two indirect speech correspondents, one with the simple past and one with the pluperfect:
(22) *Yesterday, Wendy said, 'I **arrived** yesterday.'*
(23) *Yesterday, Wendy said that she **arrived** the day before yesterday.*
(24) *Yesterday, Wendy said that she **had arrived** the day before yesterday.*

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

> There are undoubtedly stylistic differences between (23) and (24), with many stylistic purists preferring (24), but in actual usage it is clear that both possibilities exist (Comrie, 1986, p. 291).

Example (23) shows that in English indirect speech, where the matrix clause is placed in the past tense, the Simple Past (in addition to the standard Past Perfect (24)) can be used in the reported clause even if it represents «2» anteriority. In the following examples, the Simple Past of the EV is translated into two different Romanian tenses: Compound Past (25)R and Pluperfect (26)R under the same condition:

(25) R. *am auzit* [PC] *că cei trei* ***au avut*** [PC] *la cină tartă* (RV, p. 26).
E. *I heard that they* ***had*** *trifle for supper* (EV, p. 25). 224
(26) R. *Ea a jurat* [PC] *că vehiculul nu* ***fusese*** [PQP] *scos din garaj în noaptea cu pricina* (RV, p. 61).
E. *She swore that in actual fact it never* ***left*** *the garage that night* (EV, p.68). 877

As seen in (23) and (24), the relationship of «2» anteriority in English indirect speech can be expressed by either the Simple Past or the Past Perfect, and therefore, if these two tenses in such context are translated into Romanian, they can be arbitrarily replaced with either the Compound Past or the Pluperfect. While it is as yet unclear why in Table 3 there is a large quantitative difference in use between the Compound Past (A) and the Pluperfect (B) in the RV, we notice something remarkable – that is, both the highest and lowest frequency values of the whole list in Table 3 are each marked by the EV Past Perfect, with the translation into the Pluperfect (B) amounting to 53.4%, whereas it accounts for only 5.5% in the case of the Compound Past (A). Such extreme values of quantitative difference would seem to have resulted from a correlation between the English Past Perfect and the Romanian Pluperfect, which represent in common "the past seen from the past." In other words, when the Past Perfect appears in English, it is rather the Pluperfect with its clear correspondence that is more likely to be selected for the Romanian translation. It follows that, in its translation from English, the Compound Past, which should have been selected more easily because of its unmarked value, will relinquish its position to the Pluperfect. In fact, (25)E cited above is followed by another reported clause, where the Past Perfect (*had been writing*) appears:

(27) R. *am auzit* [PC] *că cei trei* ***au avut*** [PC] *la cină tartă şi că soţul* ***scrisese*** [PQP] *cuiva despre "sute şi mii"* (RV, p. 26).
E. *I heard that they* ***had*** *trifle for supper and that the husband* ***had been writing*** *to someone about hundreds and thousands* (EV, p. 25). 224

Hence, the Past Perfect is translated into the Pluperfect (*scrisese*) in the RV as if it were following the trend mentioned above. If we compare this translation with the previous context (25), where the EV Simple Past (*had*) is replaced by the RV

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

Compound Past (*au avut*), it seems that the two formal correlations are extended in (27)R[21]. It would be difficult to deny that the translated RV reflects the difference between the two original tenses of the EV.

If (27)R is an example influenced by the formal difference of the EV's original tenses, the following (28)R–(30)R are (just like (19)R–(21)R) examples of indirect speech with spontaneous tense options, uninfluenced by the original EV:

(28) R. *N-a înţeles de la început că* ***am schimbat*** *totul* (RV, p. 225).
not-has understood from beginning that have.1SG changed everything
E. *He didn't understand at first. I've changed everything* (EV, p. 259). 4036–4037

(29) R. *Am auzit că Sanders* ***a hoinărit*** *primprejur* (RV, p. 195).
have.1SG heard that Sanders has wandered around
E. *Sanders, I hear, wandered out into the grounds* (EV, p. 224). 3377

(30) R. *ea a pretins că i-****au fost*** *furate bijuteriile* (RV, p. 236).
she has pretended that CL.DAT.3SG-have.3PL been stolen the jewels
E. *[…] she pretends the jewels are stolen* (EV, p. 273). 4257

In the original (28)E and (29)E, the counterpart of the complement clause of the RV indirect speech is not a subordinate, but an independent clause; in (30)E, the verb of reporting in the matrix clause is not in the past tense, but in the Present (see footnote 16 above). The RV converts these passages into indirect speech in the past context. It is worth noting that the complement clauses in (28)R–(30)R have chosen the unmarked Compound Past in their complement clause (*am schimbat*, *a hoinărit*, and *au fost*, respectively). Indeed, of the 20 cases of the Compound Past that I selected from the RV's indirect speech (see Table 1), 10 (=20–10) cases (50.0%) were selected in such circumstances where the option is made without any influence from the original EV. Meanwhile, only 6 (=69–63) out of 69 cases (8.7%) were chosen spontaneously in the same circumstances. As already seen in (19)–(21) for «1» simultaneity, if the Romanian indirect speech in the past context is in a neutral situation, uninfluenced by the EV, there is a tendency to end up having the unmarked option in the complement clause. Our data above seems to show that this tendency is even stronger for «2» anteriority. Thus, the marked Pluperfect tends to be shunned, and the unmarked Compound Past can appear much more frequently.

5.3. «3» POSTERIORITY

This last subsection addresses «3» posteriority. Table 4 shows the frequency at which selected verbal forms of the original EV are translated into the Future (A) and the future-in-the-past (B) in the RV.

[21] In the FV, for instance, both verbs in the two reported clauses have been translated into the Pluperfect.

(i) *j'ai appris* [PC] *qu'ils* ***avaient eu*** [PQP] *du pudding au dîner et que le mari* ***avait écrit*** [PQP] *une lettre à propos de centaines et de milliers* (FV, p. 25). 224

The situation is the same for the Italian and Spanish versions, which may be due to the SOT restriction in the Western Romance languages.

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

Table 4

«3» Posteriority: Original tenses in the EV translated into the Future or the future-in-the-past in the RV

Tense in EV	Use frequency (Total: 26 cases)	Use frequency ratio	Remarks
(A) Tenses of the finite verb in the EV translated into the **Future** in the RV (22 cases)			
Preterite of modals + inf.	20 cases	76.9%	16 cases of *would*, 2 cases *should*, 1 case *could*, 1 case *might*
Simple Past	2 cases	7.7%	1 case of "*was* going *to* + Infinitive"
(B) Tenses of the finite verb in the EV translated into the **future-in-the-past** in the RV (4 cases)			
Simple Past	3 cases	11.5%	
Preterite of modals + inf.	1 case	3.8%	1 case of *would*

As shown in bold in the second half of the English indirect speech example (2), when the periphrasis with the preterite form of a modal auxiliary verb (*would kiss*) indicates «3» posteriority, the Romanian counterpart of such a periphrasis is in the Future in the latter half of (4) (*va săruta*). Thus, it is natural to predict that the Future in the RV in Table 4 (A) will be a translation of the EV periphrasis in question. In fact, in Table 4, there is an extremely high probability that the RV Future of (A) is a result of translation from the EV periphrasis with the preterite of modals (such as *would*, *should*), accounting for 76.9% of the total. One such example of the 20 of this type given below, is (31)R. Further, as seen in bold letters in (5b) and (6b), we can expect that in Romanian indirect speech, not only the Future (*va pleca*) but also the alternative type of form representing the future-in-the-past (*avea să plece*) could appear as well.[22] Despite our expectation, in (B) regarding this alternative type, we find only one case, (32)R:[23]

(31) R. *ştiam* [IMP] *că nu* ***va putea*** [FUT] *să-i facă faţă lui Geoffrey* (RV, p. 112).
E. *I knew she* ***wouldn't be*** *able to stand up against Geoffrey* (EV, p. 127). 1768
(32) R. *Ea a notat* [PC] *pe un calendar când* ***urma să fie*** [FP] *lună plină* (RV, p. 125).
E. *She marked off on a calendar the day when the moon* ***would be*** *full* (EV, p. 144). 2028

[22] It is true that (5c) can also be selected (besides (5b) and (6b)), however, we have already dealt with cases in which the EV periphrasis with the preterite of modals is translated into the RV Present or Imperfect, parallel with «1» simultaneity in § 5.1 (e.g., see (12)).

[23] Whereas *when* in (32)E introduces a relative clause, *când* 'when' in (32)R can be thought of as sufficiently introducing an indirect interrogative (i.e., a complement clause).

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

In the case of «3» posteriority, the RV makes preponderant use of the Future to the detriment of the future-in-the-past, regardless of the original EV periphrasis with the preterite of modals. This is possibly because the Future is an unmarked option for «3». However, as we have already seen in Table 1, when translation into the RV concerns «1» simultaneity and «2» anteriority, it is a marked option which is likely to appear more frequently, contrary to «3» posteriority. In fact, in Table 1, the Imperfect and the Pluperfect appear with a higher probability than the Present and the Compound Past, respectively. As we have held that the higher frequency of the Imperfect and the Pluperfect, despite their markedness, is a result of the influence of the English SOT rule, it should be considered that, for the future-in-the-past, some other factor in its very limited use is strongly influencing the tendency to avoid this marked option. One of the reasons for such a contrast can be constituted by the phenomenon that the Romanian future-in-the-past, either the *AVEAM SĂ* or *URMA SĂ* type, has not been sufficiently (or even at all) grammaticalized (see Quot. 4).[24] In this paper, we have dealt with these alternative forms as future-in-the-past, treating them in the same way as other tenses, however, as already noted, this is just a convenience to avoid complications. These forms have only a peripheral value within the Romanian tense system. Hence, it is quite plausible to think that this incomplete grammaticalization is a major factor in keeping the RV Future free from the influence of the English SOT rule.

Although (32)R is an isolated example, this phenomenon does not mean that the translator of the RV is reluctant to select the future-in-the-past. This is suggested by the list in Table 4 (B), where, if combined with the case translated from the EV Simple Past, the use of the RV future-in-the-past increases by three more cases (example (34) below is one of these cases). Meanwhile, in the list in (A), there are only two examples of the EV Simple Past translated into the RV Future (of which I cite (33)). Both (33)E and (34)E have a Simple Past progressive form (for an incomplete reanalysis of the periphrasis in (33)E (*was going to see*) as "future viewed from the past," see footnote 24):

(33) R. *ea îi spuse* [PS] *că* ***va merge*** [FUT] *să-şi viziteze sora la Golders Green* (RV, p. 119).
E. *[…] she mentioned that she* ***was going*** *to see a sister at Golders Green* (EV, p. 136). 1892
(34) R. *Mă întrebam* [IMP] *dacă şi ea* ***urma să meargă*** [FP] *la Penrithar* (RV, p. 72).
E. *I wondered whether she too* ***was going*** *to Penrithar* (EV, p. 81). 1087

[24] For example, the sentence (i)R below has the future-in-the-past in *AVEAM SĂ* type, whose auxiliary verb reveals the original lexical meaning of necessity. Note also that the corresponding English verb (in bold) in (i)E is merely in the Simple Past:

(i) R. *îl anunţase* [PQP] *că* ***avea să-i spună*** [FP] *ceva extrem de important* (RV, p. 153).
E. *She […] had told him that she* ***had*** *a communication of the gravest importance to make to him* (EV, p. 175). 2515

Examples of incomplete grammaticalization can also be found in English. For example, in (33)E, the periphrasis *was going to see*, which can be reanalyzed as a "future viewed from the past," seems to conserve the original meaning of *go*, a basic movement verb.

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

As to whether the deictic Future or the future-in-the-past is chosen in Romanian, Uricaru suggests that the choice be left to the reporting speaker:

Quot. 6: Folosirea celor două posibilităţi de indicare a posteriorităţii în Trecut: Viitorul deictic şi Perifraza cu Impf., pare să nu se supună unor reguli de distribuţie diferenţiată. *Opţiunea pare să depindă numai de locutor*, care decide asupra perspectivei din care evenimentele vor fi considerate (Uricaru, 2003, p. 190, italics mine).

"Even if we can use two different ways to indicate the posteriority in the past: the deictic Future and the periphrasis with the Imperfect [as future-in-the-past], this doesn't seem to follow any rules that distinguish the two distributions. *It seems that the choice is dependent only on the reporting speaker*, who decides on the perspective from which the events are to be considered."

Even though the Romanian periphrases as future-in-the-past are "*[r]éservées au registre écrit soutenu, surtout littéraire* 'reserved for a formal written register, especially for a literary one'" (Timoc-Bardy, 2013, p. 59, note 13), the choice between the Future and these periphrases seems to be left, ultimately, to the reporting speaker (in our case, to the translator), as Uricaru points out. Her claim can be confirmed by a broader context where the complement clause (*că nu va putea să...* 'that she would [lit.: will] not be able to…') appears in (31)R, earlier:

(35) R. *Mabel este fată bună, mi-a ţinut partea, dar ştiam* [IMP] *că nu* ***va putea*** [FUT] *să-i facă faţă lui Geoffrey. În cele din urmă,* ***avea să procedeze*** [FP] *tot cum îl tăia capul* (RV, p. 112).
E. *Mabel is a good girl – Mabel stuck up for me, but I knew she* ***would****n't* ***be*** *able to stand up against Geoffrey. In the end he* ***would have*** *his own way* (EV, p. 127). 1768–1769

On the one hand, in the original (35)E, the two periphrases in bold have the preterite form of the same modal auxiliary verb (*would*); on the other hand, in the translated (35)R, the first periphrasis is replaced by the Future (*va putea* in (31)R), but the second is substituted by the future-in-the-past (*avea să procedeze*) through free indirect speech, which could have had a matrix clause in common with (31)R (*ştiam* 'I knew'). If we consider that the Future can also appear sufficiently in the past context of Romanian free indirect speech (see Mancaş, 1972, pp. 89–90), the use of the alternative forms in bold in (35)R can be thought of as an expression of the translator's personal option.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Before summarizing our investigations thus far, let us first focus on Uricaru's assertion on the content described in Quot. 6:

Quot. 7: Este, totuşi, evident că utilizarea Viitorului este mult mai frecventă, la fel cum pentru celelalte raporturi există o preferinţă pentru formele deictice (netranspuse) (Uricaru, 2003, p. 190).

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

> "It is, however, clear that the frequency of using the Future is much higher [compared to the future-in-the-past] in the same way for the other relationships [of «1» simultaneity and «2» anteriority], where the forms preferred are the deictic ones (without backshifting into the past)".

According to this assertion, Romanian prefers the deictic tense of Present, Compound Past, and Future as an unmarked option to represent «1» simultaneity, «2» anteriority, and «3» posteriority, respectively, even in the past context. Therefore, if we analyze a text originally written in Romanian, it is quite possible that these three tenses will appear frequently. However, when analyzing the RV translated from English – a SOT language – in our Parallel corpus (2018), I obtained a result that contradicts Uricaru's claim, at least for «1» simultaneity and «2» anteriority, as in Table 1. To investigate the cause, I meticulously examined one-to-one correspondence between the EV and the RV tense forms in each of the cases «1», «2», and «3», and showed the numerical values of this correspondence in Tables 2, 3, and 4.

I have conducted a detailed analysis based on these numerical values, and the results of these analyses can be summarized into the following three points which represent the conclusions of this paper:

I. In the cases of «1» simultaneity and «2» anteriority in the past context, where the EV's reported clause makes fundamental use of the Simple Past and the Past Perfect, respectively, it does not seem easy for the translated RV to avoid being influenced by the English SOT rule. In fact, in the RV, Imperfect and Pluperfect appear in more than half of the cases for both «1» (59.4% in Table 2) and «2» (53.4% in Table 3). Therefore, I have concluded that this result, which deviates significantly from the unmarked option of Romanian, is influenced by the original SOT rule during translation.

II. In the case of «3» posteriority in the past context, where reported clauses use the periphrasis with a preterite form of a modal auxiliary verb in the EV as "future viewed from the past," the translation in the RV shows that the ratio of the Future, an unmarked option, is significantly higher (76.9% in Table 4), providing a clear contrast to the result of point I above. I speculated that such a favor for the unmarked option, without being influenced by the EV's original periphrases, arises from the incomplete grammaticalization of the periphrases of *AVEAM SĂ* and *URMA SĂ* type as "future in the past" tense.

III. Moreover, regarding the RV, in each final paragraph of § 5.1 and § 5.2, we observed that, in the context where tense choices cannot rely upon any element of the EV, "*există o preferinţă pentru formele deictice (netranspuse)* 'the forms preferred are the deictic ones (without backshifting into the past)'" (Uricaru, 2003, p. 190), even in the cases of «1» and «2». The Present of (19)R–(21)R and the Compound Past of (28)R–(30)R shown in bold are such deictic forms. This phenomenon clearly demonstrates that in the past context, if tense choices are in

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

a neutral situation, the unmarked option is preferred in Romanian indirect speech.

Last, the present contribution based on numerical values of verb tenses in indirect speech in translated Romanian text is, as far as I know, the first of its type in the literature. If my analyses have helped clarify to what extent another language interferes in the choice of each Romanian tense in indirect speech in the past context, the aim of my work has been accomplished.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ABBREVIATIONS

ELR: *Enciclopedia limbii române*. M. Sala (coord.). Bucharest, Univers Enciclopedic, 2001.
GA: *Gramatica limbii romîne*, vol. 1–2. Academia Republicii Populare Romîne. Bucharest, Editura Academiei, 1963[2].
GALR: *Gramatica limbii române*, vol. 1–2. Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică "Iorgu Iordan - Al. Rosetti." Bucharest, Editura Academiei Române, 2008.
GBLR: *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*. G. Pană Dindelegan (coord.). Bucharest, Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 2010.

TEXTS

Parallel corpus (2018): *Parallel corpus in English, French, Italian, Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese, Portugal-Portuguese and Romanian of* The thirteen problems *by Agatha Christie*, on the CD: *A contrastive study on the tempo-aspectual systems in the contemporary Romance languages*. Study supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP15K02482.

- EV (English version), FV (French version), and RV (Romanian version) reproduced in the Parallel corpus (2018) are as follows:
  EV: Agatha Christie, *The thirteen problems*. London, Harper Collins Publishers, 2002.
  FV: Agatha Christie, *Miss Marple au Club de mardi*, tr.: Sylvie Durastanti. Paris, Éditions du Masque, 2013.
  RV: Agatha Christie, *13 [treisprezece] probleme*, tr.: Cristina Mihaela Tripon. Bucharest, Editura RAO, 2014.

REFERENCES

Begioni, L. & A. Rocchetti (2013): *Comprendre la concordance des temps et son évolution comme un phénomène de déflexivité: d'une concordance, élément actif de la syntaxe (italien, français classique) à une concordance en cours de réduction (français d'aujourd'hui)*, in "Langages", 191, pp. 23–36.
Călăraşu, C. (1992): *Quelques significations des temps verbaux roumains en perspective romane (avec applications aux langues roumaine et française)*, in "Revue roumaine de linguistique", 37 (2–3), pp.137–143.
Carabulea, E. (2008): *Complementul secundar*, in GALR, vol. 2, pp. 413–417.

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)

Comrie, B. (1986): *Tense in indirect speech*, in "Folia linguistica", 20 (3–4), pp. 265–296.
ELR (2001): M. Sala (coord.), *Enciclopedia limbii române*. Bucharest, Univers Enciclopedic.
GBLR (2010): G. Pană Dindelegan (coord.), *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*. Bucharest, Univers Enciclopedic Gold.
Lungu, O. (2008): *Tense in embedded contexts: the case of Romanian*, in "Bucharest working papers in linguistics", 10 (1), pp. 21–37.
Mancaş, M. (1972): *Stilul indirect liber în româna literară*. Bucharest, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică.
Manea, D. (2008): *Timpul*, in GALR, vol. 1, pp. 394–448.
Popescu, M. (2014): *'Viitorul în trecut' în limba română contemporană: un punct de vedere semantico-pragmatic*, in "Revista de Filología Románica", 31 (1), pp. 111–125.
Suzuki, S. (2018): Romania-*go no kansetsu waho ni okeru jisei no shoo no shikata ni tsuite:* Agatha Christie *tampen-shu no eigo gembun to* Romania-*go yakubun no taio kankei o moto ni* [Agreement of tenses in Romanian indirect speech: based on the correspondence between the original English version of Agatha Christie's short stories and its Romanian translation], in *Amano Kei sensei taishoku kinen rombun-shu/Studi di lingua e letteratura offerti a Kei Amano*, Kyoto, Kyoto University, pp. 1–23.
Timoc-Bardy, R. (2013): *Le roumain: une langue «sans concordance des temps»?*, in "Langages", 191, pp. 53–66.
Uricaru, L. (2003): *Temporalitate şi limbaj*. Bucharest, Allfa.
Vântu, I. (2008): *Vorbirea directă şi vorbirea indirectă,* in GALR, vol. 2, pp. 859–868.
Vasiliu, L. (1963): *Verbul,* in GA, vol. 1, pp. 202–299.
Zafiu, R. (2013): *Mood, tense, and aspect*, in G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 24–65.

BDD-A32494 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:01:03 UTC)