The Perfect Category: A Comparison of Standard Greek and Cypriot Greek [2]

Yoryia Agouraki
University of Cyprus

The paper looks at the readings attributed to the perfect in Standard Greek and Cypriot Greek. In contrast to Standard Greek, Cypriot Greek lacks Present Perfect A'. It is examined (a) whether the existential reading and the result reading are distinct readings, and (b) which readings are expressed by Present Perfect A' and Present Perfect B' in Standard Greek, and by Present Perfect B' and Past Tense in Cypriot Greek. It is argued that the existential reading and the result reading are two distinct readings. It is also demonstrated that the existential reading and the result reading exist independently of the perfect morphology. In Cypriot Greek, in particular, the existential reading is only realized by means of past tense morphology. As for the result reading, it is realized by means of perfect morphology (cf. Present Perfect B') or past tense morphology.

Keywords: Present Perfect A', Present Perfect B', existential reading, result reading, target state.

1. Introduction

I will start with a pretheoretic description of the data. Standard Greek (SG) has Present Perfect A' (*eho* 'have' + perfective participle) and Present Perfect B' (*eho* 'have' + adjectival participle (for transitive verbs) and *ime* 'be' + adjectival participle (for intransitive verbs)). Attention must be drawn to two facts. (a) In contrast to Present Perfect A', Present Perfect B' is not compatible with all verbs[3]. And (b) The initial hypothesis that the *ime* 'be' + adjectival participle Present Perfect B' obtains with intransitive verbs turns out to be descriptively inadequate. If we go through the list of verbs that form the *ime* 'be' + adjectival participle Present Perfect B', we see that it obtains with a subclass of intransitive verbs. Points (a) and (b) are in fact related. The set of verbs which cannot form Present Perfect B' is the same as the set of intransitive verbs which cannot form the *ime* 'be' + adjectival participle Present Perfect B'. Concerning Cypriot Greek (CG), on the other hand, Menardos (1969) observes that it has Present Perfect B', but no Present Perfect A' and uses Past Tense instead. In addition, earlier point (b) is also valid for CG. Not all intransitive

verbs can form the *ime* 'be' + adjectival participle Present Perfect B'.

Going back to SG, even though the majority of verbs (that is to the exception of a subclass of intransitive verbs, which cannot form Present Perfect B') can form either Present Perfect A' or Present Perfect B', it is not always possible to substitute one form for the other, as there can be a difference in interpretation between Present Perfect A' and Present Perfect B'. Which minimally suggests that Present Perfect A' and Present Perfect B' share one reading and that Present Perfect A' has at least one more reading. It needs to be investigated what these readings are.

Section 2 presents two of the readings associated with the perfect morphology crosslinguistically, namely the existential reading and the result reading; and Kratzer's (2003) theory, according to which the distinction between these two readings is a semantic one. Before assigning readings to Present Perfect A', Present Perfect B' and Past Tense in SG, and Present Perfect B' and Past Tense in CG, Section 3 presents a number of arguments for the claim that the existential reading and the result reading are in fact distinct readings. In the frame of the proposed semantic distinction between the existential reading and the result reading, we develop an understanding of a number of points in our pretheoretic description of the data. In particular, the subclass of intransitive verbs that can form Present Perfect B' turns out to be the unaccusative class. Those verbs which cannot form Present Perfect B' are the same intransitive verbs which cannot form the *ime* 'be' + adjectival participle Present Perfect B', namely the class of unergative verbs. Next, in Sections 4 and 5 the paper addresses the question how the existential and the result readings pattern with SG and CG tenses. The claims advanced appear in (1) and (2).

(1)   Standard Greek
a.   Present Perfect A' is ambiguous between the existential reading and the result reading.
b.   Present Perfect B' can only have the result reading.
c.   Past Tense is three-way ambiguous between the 'definite' reading, the existential reading and the result reading.
(2)   Cypriot Greek
a.   Present Perfect B' can only have the result reading.
b.   Past Tense is three-way ambiguous between the 'definite' reading, the existential reading and the result reading.

2. Uses of the Present Perfect

1.1 The Existential/Result Distinction

The meaning of the perfect requires an interval, the perfect time span (cf. Iatridou, Anagnostopoulou and Izvorski 2001). The left boundary (LB) of this time span is set by the argument of the *since* -adverbial. The right boundary (RB) is set by tense on the perfect auxiliary. In the Present Perfect the RB is the utterance time. I will only look at the existential perfect and the perfect of result, and will not discuss the universal perfect or the perfect of recent past.

The existential perfect asserts that within the perfect time span there is some (at least one) interval in which an (un)bounded eventuality occurs. The unbounded versus bounded eventuality distinction was proposed by Iatridou, Anagnostopoulou and Izvorski (2001:191): "An eventuality is described as unbounded when it is ongoing at an interval (and is therefore not asserted to have reached an endpoint - achievement of the goal, in the case of telics; termination for atelics.) An eventuality is described as bounded when it is contained in an interval (i.e., when it is asserted to have completed/terminated).". Examples (3) and (4) involve a bounded and an unbounded eventuality, respectively. According to Iatridou, Anagnostopoulou and Izvorski (2001), a proper inclusion requirement holds for the existential reading; namely, the boundaries of the perfect time span cannot be part of the eventuality.

(3) Existential reading, bounded eventuality
    eho psifisi   dhio fores   apo to 1994
    have-I voted   twice   since the 1994
    "I have voted twice since 1994."

(4) Existential reading, unbounded eventuality
    eho ZISI[4]   sti Lefkosia   apo to 1994
    have-I LIVED in Nicosia   since the 1994
    "Since 1994 there has been a period during which I have lived in Nicosia."

The perfect of result is taken to be possible only with telic predicates and only for so long as the effect of the underlying eventuality holds. Example (5) can be a result perfect only if said while my arm is still broken. As soon as my arm heals, (5) can only be said as an existential perfect.

(5) eho spasi   to heri mu
    have-I broken   the arm-ACC my
    "I have broken my arm."

The general tendency is to assume that the perfect of result is not an independent category but a subcase of the existential perfect. A couple of researchers have argued otherwise (cf. Brugger 1997 and Kratzer 2003).

1.2 Kratzer's (2003) proposal for the result reading

Before defining the result reading, we need to look at Parsons' (1990) analysis of an event's "target state". Parsons argues that the perfect is a construction that produces a state description from an event (or state) description. For every event e that culminates, there is a corresponding state that holds forever after. This is the state of e's having culminated, which Parsons calls the "resultant state of e". Notably, the resultant state of an event is distinguished from its target state. Parsons (1990:235) illustrates the two notions with the following example: "If I throw a ball onto the roof, the target state of this event is the ball's being on the roof, a state that may or may not last for a long time. … the Resultant-state is different; it is the state of my having thrown the ball onto the roof, and it is a state that cannot cease holding at some later time.".

Kratzer (2003) builds a semantic analysis of the perfect of result on Parsons' "target state". In particular, she claims that as a semantic category the perfect of result is encoded in the meaning of the adjectival suffix in adjectival participles. She shows that the verbs that can form adjectival participles are precisely those that comfortably allow the perfect of result in that they are easily conceptualized as having target states.

Prima facie, Present Perfect B′ data in SG and CG seem to confirm Kratzer's theory. As shown in Sections 4 and 5 for SG and CG, respectively, Present Perfect B′, which is formed with the adjectival participle, can only have the result reading. And if we attempt to identify the class of predicates that can form adjectival participles, we find out that it is the same class of predicates that can form (a) adjectival participles and (b) Present Perfect B′. However, a closer examination of SG and CG data suggests we should take into account the following facts. In SG, besides Present Perfect B′, Present Perfect A′ can also express the result reading. Crucially, Present Perfect A′ is formed with an invariable perfective participle of the lexical verb, which is not an adjectival participle. In the case of SG, it is, therefore, not possible to claim that the result reading resides in the meaning of the adjectival suffix of the adjectival participle. For this reason I will adopt the 'smaller' hypothesis that the class of predicates that can form adjectival participles is compatible with the result reading. In the case of CG as well, Kratzer's stronger hypothesis is not confirmed, as Past Tense can also have the result reading.

3. The Existential/Result Distinction is Semantic

So far the only diagnostic test we have for the existential reading is the availability of eventuality-level adverbials. Next, I will present nine arguments for the claim that the existential/result distinction is a semantic one. For arguments 6(a)-(g) I am only looking at Present Perfect A′ forms. Arguments

6(h)-(i) are built on Present Perfect B'. Arguments 6(a)-(g) can be used as diagnostic tests for distinguishing between the existential and the result reading.

(6)   Diagnostic tests for distinguishing between the existential reading and the result reading:
a.   Possible vagueness w.r.t. the number of events.
b.   Focal stress on the lexical verb.
c.   Temporal placement of the event.
d.   Availability of the *poson kero? / posi ora?* 'how long for?' question.
e.   Availability/ interpretation of the adverbial *idhi* 'already, as early as'.
f.   Temporal interpretation of clauses embedded under present perfect predicates.
g.   Interpretation of the prefix *ksana* – 'again'.
h.   The single reading of Present Perfect B' versus the ambiguous reading of Present Perfect A'.
i.   The unavailability of Present Perfect B' with unergative predicates.

a. Possible vagueness with respect to the number of events.
In their discussion of the existential reading, Iatridou, Anagnostopoulou and Izvorski (2001:200) make the point that "When there is no overt eventuality-level adverbial, the context (possibly as a default mechanism along the lines of existential closure (Heim 1982) provides one with roughly the meaning '(at least) once' (henceforth, *ONCE*)". Consider (7), where the subject may have gone to the States more than once. While with the result reading only one eventuality can be involved (cf. 8(b)).

(7)   Existential reading
    ehi PAI   stin ameriki ke   kseri   pos   ine
    has-he GONE to the States and knows-he how is-it
    "He has been to the States and he knows how it is."

(8)   Result reading
a.   Pu   ine   o Tasos   ?
    where is   the Tasos-NOM. ?
    "Where is Tasos?"
b.   ehi pai   stin ameriki
    has-he gone   to the States-ACC.
    "He has gone to the States."

b. Focal stress on the lexical verb
This is a phonological test to distinguish between the existential reading and the result reading. In particular, a sentence with an existential perfect places focal stress on the overt eventuality-level adverbial or equivalent expression[5], as in

(9). In the absence of an overt eventuality-level adverbial in the sentence, the existential reading seems to require focal stress on the lexical verb (cf. (10)). The result reading, in contrast, requires no focal stress, as illustrated in example (11), and normally places default stress on the final content word of the sentence.

(9) Existential reading
ehi alaksi   dhio FORES   ghrafio   apo ton oktovrio
has-he moved   TWICE   office-ACC. since the october-ACC.
"He has moved office twice since last October."
     (10) Existential reading
         ehi ALAKSI   ghrafio   apo ton oktovrio
         has-he MOVED   office-ACC.   since the october-ACC.
"He has moved office (at least once) since last October."
     (11) Result reading
         ehi alaksi   ghrafio   apo ton OKTOVRIO
         has-he moved   office-ACC.   since the OCTOBER-ACC.
         "He has been in a different office since last October."

The question arises about the role played by the focal stress on the verb in the case of the existential reading. It is relevant at this point to remember Iatridou, Anagnostopoulou and Izvorski's (2001) assumption that in the absence of an overt eventuality-level adverbial, the context, as a default mechanism along the lines of existential closure, provides an eventuality-level adverbial with the meaning 'at least once'. It could be argued that the role of the focal stress on the lexical verb is to trigger this default mechanism.

c. Temporal placement of the event
In line with Iatridou, Anagnostopoulou and Izvorski (2001), I have assumed that the LB of the perfect time span is set by the argument of *apo* 'since', while its RB is the utterance time. If we go back to the existential reading in earlier example (10), the eventuality of moving office could have taken place at any interval between last October and the utterance time. As argued by Iatridou, Anagnostopoulou and Izvorski (2001), the eventuality cannot be placed at either the LB or the RB of the perfect time span. Interestingly, in the perfect of result the eventuality is obligatorily placed at the LB of the perfect time span. Thus, in (11) the eventuality of moving office can only have taken place last October.

d. Availability of the *poson kero? / posi ora?* 'how long?' question.
With the result reading (cf. (12)), but not with the existential reading (cf. (13)), it is possible to formulate the question *poson kero? / posi ora?* 'how long?' to enquire about the interval that has elapsed since the eventuality was completed

and up to the utterance time.

> (12) Result reading
> a.   eho mayiremena
>   have-I cooked
>   "I have cooked."
>
> b.   posi ora   ?
>   how much hour ?
>   "Since when?"
> (13) Existential reading
> a.   ehi htenisi   ti Madonna
>   has-he done the hair   the Madonna-ACC.
>   "He has done Madonna's hair."
> b.   *poson kero   ?
>   how much time   ?

e. Availability and interpretation of the adverbial *idhi* 'already, as early as'.
The adverbial *idhi* is compatible with both the existential and the result readings. Example (14) below is ambiguous between an existential and a result reading. Note that example (14) does not contain a *since* –adverbial.

> (14) ehi   idhi   alaksi ghrafio
>   has-he already moved office-ACC.
>   "He has already moved office."

Next, I am going to take former examples (10) and (11), which contain a *since* – adverbial, and check whether *idhi* is still possible in both the existential and the result reading (cf. (15) and (16), respectively). The examples are ungrammatical, despite the grammaticality of (14). Which suggests that *idhi* is in complementary distribution with *since* -adverbials in both the existential and the result reading. The interpretation of *idhi* so far has been that of 'already'.

> (15) *ehi   idhi   ALAKSI ghrafio   apo ton oktovrio
>   has-he already MOVED office-ACC. since the october-ACC.
> (16) *ehi   idhi   alaksi ghrafio   apo ton OKTOVRIO
>   has-he already moved office-ACC. since the OCTOBER-ACC.

Finally, it is examined whether *idhi* can modify the *since* –adverbial in either the existential or the result reading. We see that when *idhi* modifies the *since* - adverbial, it is only compatible with the result reading (cf. (18)); hence the ungrammaticality of (17) in the existential reading. The reading of *idhi*

modifying the *since* –adverbial is 'as early as'.

    (17) Existential reading
        *ehi ALAKSI   ghrafio   idhi   apo ton oktovrio
        has-he MOVED office-ACC. as early as since the october-ACC.
    (18) Result reading
        ehi alaksi   ghrafio   idhi   apo ton OKTOVRIO
        has-he moved   office-ACC. as early as since the OCTOBER-ACC.
        "He has been in a different office since as early as last October."

f. Temporal interpretation of clauses embedded under present perfect predicates.
Brugger (1997) has shown that in English the existential present perfect allows
both the simultaneous and the shifted interpretation for embedded past tense
clauses. The same appears to be the case in SG. Thus, (19) allows for the
simultaneous interpretation and the shifted interpretation. In contrast with the
existential perfect, the result perfect only allows the shifted reading (cf. (20)).

    (19) Existential reading
        tu   eho pi   oti   imun arosti
        him have-I told that was-I ill-FEM.
        "I have told him that I was ill."
    (20) Result reading
        ton eho enimerosi   oti   imun arosti
        him have-I informed that was-I ill-FEM.
        "I have informed him that I was ill."

g. Interpretation of the prefix *ksana* – 'again'.
I owe this argument to Clio Condoravdi. The existential reading and the result
reading pattern differently with respect to the interpretation of the verbal prefix
ksana – 'again'. In the existential perfect (cf. (21)) the prefix *ksana* - marks that
there has been at least one other occurrence of the eventuality. While in the
result perfect (cf. (22)) the prefix *ksana* - is interpreted as 'before'.

    (21) Existential reading
        to 2001   emina   egios   sti Maria
        the 2001   became-I pregnant-NOM. with the Mary-ACC.
        apo tote   eho ksana-MINI   egios
        since then have-I again-BECOME pregnant-NOM.
        "In 2001 I became pregnant with Mary. Since then I have become
        pregnant again (at least once)."
    (22) Result reading
        eho ksana-MINI   egios

have-I again-BECOME pregnant-NOM.

"I have been pregnant before."

h. The single reading of Present Perfect B′ versus the ambiguous reading of Present Perfect A′.

If we apply arguments (a)-(g) to Present Perfect B′ forms we see that, in contrast to Present Perfect A′, which is ambiguous between an existential and a result reading (cf. 23)), Present Perfect B′ only has a result reading. Ungrammatical (24) involves a clash between the presence of the eventuality-level adverbial *pote* 'ever', a marker of the existential reading, and the form of Present Perfect B′, which can only have the result reading.

(23)   ehis dhiavasi   Monti   ?
       have-you read   Montis-ACC.   ?
       "Have you read Montis"

(24)   *ehis dhiavasmeno   pote   Monti   ?
       have-you read   ever   Montis-ACC.   ?

In (24) the ungrammaticality of Present Perfect B′ in the existential reading supports the hypothesis that the result reading and the existential reading are distinct readings. If the result reading were a subcase of the existential reading, then, given the appropriate context, it should be possible to obtain the existential reading with Present Perfect B′, as well. But it is not.

i. The unavailability of Present Perfect B′ with unergative predicates.

A closer look at the classes of predicates which can form Present Perfect B′ supplies additional evidence for the proposed distinction between the existential reading and the result reading. Although it is possible to have Present Perfect B′ with three-place predicates (Agent, Theme, Goal), two-place predicates (Agent, Theme) and a subclass of one-place predicates, namely unaccusative predicates, it is not possible to have Present Perfect B′ with the other subclass of one-place predicates, namely unergative predicates (cf. ungrammatical (25)).

(25) *ime tilefonimenos
      am-I phoned-MASC.-SING.
      "I have phoned."

What the unavailability of Present Perfect B′ with unergative predicates reduces to is the incompatibility between the result reading and unergative predicates. If there is, in fact, this strong correspondence between a syntactic typology of predicates and the result reading, this could be taken as a strong argument for

the semantic basis of the distinction between the existential reading and the result reading. And that is not something you can manipulate through context.

4. Standard Greek

On the basis of SG data, I have presented nine arguments for the claim that the result reading is distinct from the existential reading and I have argued (a) that Present Perfect A′ is ambiguous between the existential reading and the result reading, and (b) that Present Perfect B′ only has the result reading. Arguments 6(a)-(g) may function as diagnostic tests. The context can also determine which reading a particular utterance has. Sometimes, the context does more than that. I will next present a case where the context could 'override' the outcome of a particular diagnostic test, namely the 'focal stress on the lexical verb' test. Earlier examples (10) and (11), repeated below, are contrasted.

    (10) Existential reading
        ehi ALAKSI   ghrafio   apo ton oktovrio
        has-he MOVED office-ACC. since the october-ACC.
        "He has moved office (at least once) since last October."

    (11) Result reading
        ehi alaksi   ghrafio   apo ton OKTOVRIO
        has-he moved   office-ACC. since the OCTOBER-ACC.
        "He has been in a different office since last October."

According to this test, obligatory focal stress on the lexical verb marks the existential reading. In this case focal stress on the lexical verb (cf. (10)) is not interpreted as semantic focus; its function is to trigger the default mechanism which provides an eventuality-level adverbial with the meaning 'at least once'. But at the same time focal stress on the verb can alternatively be interpreted as contrastive focus on the verb or the verb phrase. Could (10) be ambiguous between an existential reading with no semantic focus on the verb and a result reading with contrastive focus on the verb? It turns out it could, as long as we had a context that favors a 'contrastive verb focus' reading (cf. (26) next).

    (26)   Result reading, with contrastive focus on the verb.
        pistepse   me ehi ALAKSI   ghrafio apo ton oktovri
        believe-IMP.-you me has-he MOVED office   since october-ACC.
        "Believe me. He did move office last October."

Example (26) does not show that the 'focal stress on the lexical verb' test does not always hold. Rather, that it must be accompanied with absence of a focal interpretation.

At this point I would like to raise two questions. First, whether the result reading of Present Perfect B′ is accounted for in terms of the elements present in its morphosyntactic representation. And second, whether the existential reading and the result reading are exclusively associated with the perfect. To address the morphosyntactic representation of Present Perfect B′ first, I would like to bring attention to the following three points: (a) the choice between the auxiliary *eho* 'have' and the auxiliary *ime* 'be', (b) the unavailability of ergative predicates in Present Perfect B′, and (c) the *-menos* adjectival participle. Points (b) and (c) are, in fact, related. Only unaccusative predicates can form *-menos* adjectival participles. However, according to (b), it is not just unaccusative predicates that can form Present Perfect B′; two-place predicates and three-place predicates can, too. Properties (b) and (c) are reconciled, if we assume that two-place and three-place predicates, in having a Theme in their theta-grid, can, and indeed trigger an unaccusative component as part of their lexical meaning in the result reading of the perfect. Why can't unergative predicates form Present Perfect B′? Allegedly, because the precondition of assigning a Theme is not satisfied. I am not claiming that unaccusative predicates cannot have the existential reading. The existential reading makes sense for all kinds of eventualities. On the other hand, the result reading is not compatible with all eventualities. The morphosyntax of Present Perfect B′ excludes the possibility of it expressing the existential reading.

Finally, the second of the two questions raised earlier. Namely, whether the existential and the result readings are exclusively associated with the perfect. It does not seem so. The existential reading and the result reading exist independently of the perfect morphology. In particular, in SG the existential and the result reading can also obtain with past tense morphology, as long as there are overt or covert adverbials to set the LB and the RB of a time span within which there is some (at least one) interval in which the subject has a certain experience (in the case of existential reading); alternatively (in the case of the result reading), the *since* -adverbial sets the LB of a time span, at which LB the subject has an experience, the effect of which still holds. Example (27), where the verb is in the past tense has the same interpretation as earlier example (3).

(27) psifisa   dhio fores   apo to 1994
     voted-I   twice   since the 1994
     "I have voted twice since 1994."

We have seen that the LB of the perfect time span is set by the argument of *apo* 'since' and the RB is set by the present tense of the perfect auxiliary. We could assume that, if not by the present tense on the perfect auxiliary, in the case of past tense having an existential reading the RB is alternatively set by an overt or covert adverbial *mehri simera* 'up to today' or *mehri tora* 'up to now'.

Obviously, one of the two, i.e. present tense on the perfect auxiliary or an overt/ covert adverbial, would suffice to set the RB. In principle, it should then be possible to set a time span without the perfect morphology. And it seems that this is optionally the case in SG. To sum up, a description of the state of affairs in SG appears in (1), repeated below.

(1)   Standard Greek
a.   Present Perfect A′ is ambiguous between the existential reading and the result reading.
b.   Present Perfect B′ can only have the result reading.
    c.   Past Tense is three-way ambiguous between the 'definite' reading, the
existential reading and the result reading.

5. Cypriot Greek

As already pointed out, Cypriot Greek is characterized by lack of Present Perfect A′. A description of the state of affairs in CG appears in (2), repeated below.

(2)   Cypriot Greek
a.   Present Perfect B′ can only have the result reading.
b.   Past Tense is three-way ambiguous between the 'definite' reading, the existential reading and the result reading.

5.1 Result reading

In Cypriot Greek, the result reading may be realized by means of Present Perfect B′, as seen in (28). The eventuality is placed at the left boundary of the perfect time span, i.e. this morning at ten o'clock.

(28) eho   ta   mairemena ta faya   pu tis dheka
        have-I   them   cooked   the dishes-ACC.   since the ten (o'clock)
        "As early as ten o'clock (this morning) I finished cooking a number of dishes. (They are ready for us.)"

Alternatively, the result reading is realized by means of Past Tense (cf. (29)).

(29) alaksen   ghrafion   pu ton oktovrin
        moved-he   office-ACC.   since the October-ACC.
        "He has been in another office since last October."

If, as claimed in 2(b), Past Tense in Cypriot Greek is three-way ambiguous between the 'definite' reading, the existential reading and the result reading, how can we tell the past tense in (29) has the result reading. The clue is generally provided by the context. The context for (29) is the following: A is looking for B, goes to the office where B used to work, A does not find B there, and the people who currently work in that office utter (29). In a different context, the sentence would have an existential reading. The *since* –adverbial blocks the 'definite' reading for (29). In addition to the context specification for (29), the diagnostic tests for distinguishing between the existential and the result reading can be applied to (29). Thus, in the context described above, there should be a ban on "at least once" reading. Moreover, the default stress should not fall on the lexical verb, unless the latter is focused. Also, the eventuality of moving office should be obligatorily placed last October. There is actually a version of the *since* –adverbial that is only compatible with the result reading, i.e. *eshi pu ... pu* 'it is since … that', in contrast to the 'simple' form of the *since* –adverbial, which is compatible with either the result or the existential reading (cf. (30).

    (30) eshi pu ton oktovrin   pu   alaksen ghrafion
          it is since the October-ACC.   that moved-he office-ACC.
          "He has been in another office since last October."

Moreover, it should be possible to form the question *poson keron/ posin oran eshi pu ...* 'how long is it that …?', to enquire about the interval that has elapsed since the eventuality was completed and up to the utterance time. The adverbial *idhi* 'as early as' must be able to modify the *since* –adverbial. The simultaneous interpretation should not be available for a clause embedded under a 'result' past tense. The prefix *ksana –* should be interpreted as 'before', rather than 'again'. The prefix *ksana –* interpreted as 'before' is actually one of the markers for the result reading (cf. (31) from Karyolemou 1995).

    (31)   eksanapires   etsi tsighara   ?
             took-you before such cigarettes ?
             "Have you tried this make of cigarettes before?"

5.2 Existential reading

As for the existential reading, this is realized in CG by means of past tense morphology (cf. (32)). In addition to the context and the diagnostic tests, there are a number of markers for the existential reading. These include *potte* 'ever' (cf. (32)), *kammia fora* 'any time', *sti zoi mu* 'in my life', *os tora* 'up to now' and overt eventuality-level adverbials.

54

(32) epies   potte stin amerikin   ?
     went-you ever   to the States-ACC. ?
     "Have you ever gone to the States?"

33(a) below is the context for 33(b) and 33(c). 33(b) shows that past tense can express the existential reading. The ungrammaticality of 33(c), on the other hand, shows that Present Perfect B′ cannot express the existential reading.

(33)
a. en   mairefki potte
    not   cooks   ever
    "He never cooks."
b. yati lalis psemata ? emairepsa   poles fores
    why tell-you lies-ACC. ? cooked-Past-I many times
    "Why do you lie? I have cooked many times."
c. yati lalis psemata ? *eho mairemena   poles fores
    why tell-you lies-ACC. ? have-I cooked-Pr.PerfB′ many times

Cypriot Greek has both Past Perfect A′ and Past Perfect B′ (cf. (34) and (35), respectively, from Karyolemou 1995).

(34) iha   tus   milisi ya tuton to thema
     had-I to-them talked about this the subject-ACC.
     "I had talked to them about this subject"
(35) ihamen kalesmenus ton Spiron   ton Nikon   aftus ulus
     had-we invited   the Spiros-ACC. the Nikos-ACC. them all-ACC
     "We had invited Spiros, Nicos, the whole lot."

The question arises whether it is expected for a dialect to have Past Perfect A′, when it does not have Present Perfect A′. According to Nikolaos Pantelidis (p.c.), this patterning is representative of Greek dialects in general. Brian Joseph informs me that the formation of (compositional) Past Perfect A′ takes place in the 13th century, as a loan from the Romance languages, while the formation of (compositional) Present Perfect A′ takes place in the 17th century. We assume that Cypriot Greek, like other Greek dialects, never adopted Present Perfect A′.

6. Conclusions

55

I have argued that the existential reading and the result reading are two distinct readings. I have also demonstrated, through empirical facts from Standard Greek and Cypriot Greek, that the existential reading and the result reading exist independently of the perfect morphology. In Cypriot Greek, in particular, the existential reading is only realized by means of past tense morphology. As for the result reading, it is realized by means of perfect morphology (cf. Present Perfect B′) or past tense morphology.

7. Notes

[3] The reason for that is not morphological. The problem seems to be that the lexical reading of some verbs is not compatible with the reading of Present Perfect B′.

[4] Capital letters mark obligatory stress on the lexical verb. Why this is so is addressed in Section 3, and in particular in the discussion of *focal stress on the lexical verb* .

[5] In example (1) below, I take the linguistic expression *ke sto parelthon* 'in the past, too' to be an expression equivalent to an eventuality-level adverbial because it entails the eventuality-level adverbial 'at least once'.

(1)   Existential reading
        ehi alaksi   ghrafio   ke sto parelthon
        has-he moved   office-ACC.   and in the past-ACC.
        "He has moved office in the past, too."

8. References

Brugger, G. 1997. "Event time properties". *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium* , ed. by A. Dimitriadis, L. Siegel, C. Surek-Clark & A. Williams, 51-63. Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics 4.2. Penn Linguistics Club, University of Pennsylvania.

Iatridou, Sabine, Anagnostopoulou, Elena & Izvorski, Roumyana 2001. "Observations about the Form and Meaning of the Perfect." *Ken Hale: A Life in Language* , ed. by M. Kenstowicz, 189-238. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Karyolemou, Marilena. 1995. "Accommodation theory and the use of aorist in the Cypriot dialect." *Proceedings of the Second International*

Conference on Greek Linguistics, ed. by G. Drachman, A. Malikouti-
Drachman, J. Fykias & C. Klidi, Vol. II, 707-716. Salzburg:
University of Salzburg.

Kratzer, A. 2003. *The Event Argument and the Semantics of Verbs*. Ms.,
University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Menardos, Simos. 1969. *Γλωσσικαί Μελέται* [Linguistic Studies]. Nicosia:
Centre for Scientific Research.

Parsons, T. 1990. *Events in the Semantics of English: A Study in Subatomic
Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Veloudis, Ioannis. 1990. "Ο Μεταγλωσσικός Χαρακτήρας του
Παρακειμένου: Παρακείμενος Α'" [The Metalinguistic Character of
the Present Perfect: Present Perfect A']. *Studies in Greek Linguistics*,
10: 359-377. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis.

Veloudis, Ioannis. 1991. "Ο Μεταγλωσσικός Χαρακτήρας του
Παρακειμένου: Παρακείμενος Β'". [The Metalinguistic Character of
the Present Perfect: Present Perfect B']. *Studies in Greek Linguistics*,
11: 195-214. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis.

Veloudis, Ioannis. 2003. "Possession and conversation: the case of the category
"perfect"." *Perfect Explorations*, ed. by A. Alexiadou, M. Rathert, &
A. von Stechow (eds). The Hague: Mouton.

Hadziioannou, Kyriacos. 1999. *Γραμματική της Ομιλουμένης Κυπριακής
Διαλέκτου* [Grammar of the Spoken Cypriot Dialect]. Nicosia:
Tamassos.

9. Περίληψη

Το άρθρο ασχολείται με τις σημασίες που αποδίδονται στον παρακείμενο στην Κοινή και
την Κυπριακή. Σε αντίθεση με την Κοινή, η Κυπριακή έχει μόνο Παρακείμενο Β', και
δεν έχει Παρακείμενο Α'. Συγκεκριμένα εξετάζεται (α) Εάν η υπαρκτική σημασία και η
σημασία του αποτελέσματος είναι διακριτές σημασίες και (β) Ποιες σημασίες εκφράζει ο
Παρακείμενος Α' και ο Παρακείμενος Β' στην Κοινή, και ο Παρακείμενος Β' και ο
Αόριστος στην Κυπριακή.