

only by the type of accessibility relation (see Kratzer 1981), circumstantial accessibility relation (see 5) for the canonical present perfect or epistemic accessibility relation for evidential present perfect (see 6).

In this framework, the canonical present perfect instantiates full utterance anchoring: the present-tense auxiliary binds both temporal and world variables at TP, fixing evaluation to speech time and the actual world. Because t is identified with t_0 , definite past adverbials introduce conflicting temporal anchoring, yielding the well-known incompatibility with modifiers such as *včera* ('yesterday').

(5) $[[\text{CANONICAL PERFECT}]] = \lambda t. \lambda w. \lambda P. \exists t' [t' \leq t \wedge \forall w' \in f_{\text{circ}}(t)(w): P(t')(w')]$

The reportative evidential represents the opposite configuration. Both temporal and world variables are bound by a higher epistemic operator associated with reportative evidence. Evaluation proceeds relative to a reported information state rather than the utterance context. Since neither variable is anchored to t_0/w_0 , auxiliary realization becomes semantically redundant and is systematically omitted. The absence of speech-time anchoring also explains compatibility with definite past adverbials.

(6) $[[\text{EVID PERFECT}]] = \lambda t. \lambda w. \lambda P. \exists t' [t' \leq t \wedge \forall w' \in f_{\text{epist}}(t)(w): P(t')(w')]$

The inferential evidential exhibits hybrid anchoring. Building on distinctions between reportative and inferential strategies in Bulgarian (Simeonova 2015; Smirnova 2013), we argue that its temporal variable is bound relative to an inference time, while the world variable remains anchored to the actual world via TP. Because world anchoring must be structurally realized, auxiliary omission is impossible. At the same time, since t is not identified with t_0 , definite past adverbials are permitted. Inferential evidentials thus combine epistemic temporal anchoring with circumstantial world anchoring, deriving their mixed morphosyntactic profile.

This analysis yields several broader consequences. First, auxiliary realization diagnoses the locus and type of anchoring in the clausal spine. Second, canonical and evidential perfects are unified under a single relative-tense semantics rather than divided into temporal versus modal classes. Third, reportative evidentials instantiate full epistemic anchoring of both temporal and world variables, whereas inferentials instantiate hybrid anchoring. Finally, the distribution of definite past adverbials follows from independently motivated principles of temporal anchoring rather than construction-specific stipulations. Bulgarian thus provides morphosyntactic evidence that perfect constructions differ not in core semantic type, but in how temporal and modal variables are anchored. The interaction of auxiliary realization and adverbial compatibility reflects distinct configurations of temporal anteriority and modal accessibility, supporting a unified modal-temporal theory of the perfect, in which evidentiality emerges from anchoring rather than from a fundamentally distinct semantic class.

References: Cinque, G. (1999). *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. OUP. • Grønn, A., & von Stechow, A. (2020). The present perfect puzzle. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 43(1). • Hacquard, V. (2010). On the event relativity of modal auxiliaries. *Natural Language Semantics*, 18(1). • Izvorski, R. (1997). The present perfect as an epistemic modal. In A. Lawson (Ed.), *Proceedings of SALT VII*. • Karagjosova, E. (2004). The meaning and use of the inferential mood in Bulgarian. *Linguistics*, 42(6). • Klein, W. (1992). The present perfect puzzle. *Language*, 68(3). • Kratzer, A. (1981). The notional category of modality. In H.-J. Eikmeyer & H. Rieser (Eds.), *Words, worlds, and contexts: New approaches in word semantics*, Walter de Gruyter. • Kratzer, A. (1991). Modality. In A. von Stechow & D. Wunderlich (Eds.), *Semantics: An international handbook of contemporary research*, Walter de Gruyter. • Matthewson, L., Davis, H., & Rullmann, H. (2007). Evidentials as epistemic modals: Evidence from St'át'imcets. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*. • Pancheva, R., & Zubizarreta, M. L. (2023). On the syntax of perfect constructions. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*. • Pitsch, H. (2018). Prosody and evidentiality in Bulgarian: The interactional management of epistemic stance. *J. of Pragmatics*, 136. Portner, P. (2000). The (temporal) semantics and (modal) pragmatics of the perfect. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 23(6). • Rowling, J. K. (2012). *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. Pottermore Ltd. • Simeonova, V., and S. Arslan (2025) From Fables to Newspapers: Turkish and Bulgarian Evidentiality in Written Genres'. *Balkanica et Slavia*, no. 1. • Smirnova, A. (2013). Evidentiality in Bulgarian: Temporal anchoring and epistemic commitment. *Journal of Semantics*, 30(4). • Bulgarian: *Хару Потър и философският камък*, 2000, ed. Egmont; translator: T. Dzhebanova.