

Uniformity and interpretation constraints for mood and tense in German

Sander Nederveen, Simon Fraser University

This paper accounts for variation between the indicative and subjunctive in German reported speech contexts. The subjunctive always gets sequence of tense (SOT) interpretations (von Stechow, 1995), and the complement need only be true for the attitude holder, shown in (1). The indicative always gets a double access reading (DAR) (Abusch, 1988; Ogihara, 1995), but in V2-contexts the complement proposition must be evaluated as true for the speaker (Sode & Truckenbrodt, 2018). The indicative contexts are shown in (2).

- (1) a. Saskia glaubt, [dass Maria in Vancouver sei/wäre]
 Saskia believes that Maria in Vancouver be_{<pres/past>}
- b. Saskia glaubt, [Maria sei/wäre in Vancouver]
 Saskia believes, Maria be_{<pres/past>} in Vancouver
- (2) a. Saskia glaubt, [dass Maria in Vancouver ist]
 Saskia believes that Maria in Vancouver is_{<pres>}
- b. Saskia glaubt, Maria #ist in Vancouver
 Saskia believes, Maria is_{<pres>} in Vancouver

Earlier accounts have not accounted for the tense and modal patterns in a unified way (Fabricius-Hansen & Saebo, 2004; Schlenker, 2004; Schlenker, 2005; Giorgi, 2009; Sode & Truckenbrodt, 2018). I assume that the speaker commitment observed in indicative V2 is a result of the complement proposition being evaluated in the utterance world — i.e. an unbound world variable. I build on a pronominal theory of tense (t) (cf. Partee, 1989), where the pronoun can be referential (as in the case of DAR in (2a)), or bound (as in SOT). Building on Kratzer, 1998, I treat the subjunctive as the spell-out of a minimal tense pronoun, i.e. a temporal index (cf. Kratzer, 2009). Bare indices that move to a functional head are interpreted as binders, binding their trace (Kratzer, 2005; 2009, among others), but the referential tense [pres] cannot be bound, therefore indicative always gives rise to DAR. SOT arises either through T-C movement (in 5), or via binding by a base-generated binder in C (in 4) (cf. Chierchia, 1989). The referential tense of indicative in T cannot be bound by C, but the proposition's world variable can (in 6), deriving DAR but no speaker commitment. To force speaker commitment in V2 indicative I propose a constraint on binder indices as given in (3).

- (3) *Uniformity Principle*: A functional head cannot simultaneously be interpreted as both a binder head and a referential head.

The Uniformity Principle rules out representations like (7) because The C^0 in (7) ([PRES], λw) violates Uniformity: when they are both bundled on the same head, [PRES] cannot be interpreted referentially when the world variable is a binder (i.e. as λw). So the world variable is forced to be unbound - i.e. speaker commitment. Uniformity is not violated by either T^0 or C^0 in (6).

- (4) *V-final subjunctive* (1a)
 $[_{CP} [_{C^0} \lambda \langle w, t \rangle] [_{TP} \dots [_{T^0} \langle w, t \rangle]]]$
- (5) *V2 subjunctive* (1b)
 $[_{CP} [_{C^0} \lambda \langle w, t \rangle] [_{TP} \dots [_{T^0} \langle w, t \rangle]]]$
- (6) *V-final indicative* (2a)
 $[_{CP} [_{C^0} \lambda w] [_{TP} \dots [_{T^0} \langle [PRES], w \rangle]]]$
- (7) *V2 indicative* (2b)
 $[_{CP} [_{C^0} [PRES], \lambda w] [_{TP} \dots [_{T^0} \langle w, t \rangle]]]$

In conclusion, the Uniformity Hypothesis comprehensively accounts for the tense and modal (world-binding) patterns in German reportative contexts.

References

- Abusch, D. (1988). Sequence of tense, intensionality, and scope. *The Proceedings of WCCFL 7*, 663–379.
- Chierchia, G. (1989). Anaphora and attitudes "de se". In R. Bartsch, J. van Benthem, & P. van Emde Boas (Eds.), *Semantics and contextual expression* (pp. 1–31). Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Fabricius-Hansen, C., & Saebo, K. (2004). In a mediative mood: The semantics of the german reportive subjunctive. *Natural Language Semantics*, 12, 213–257.
- Giorgi, A. (2009). Towards a syntax of mood. *Lingua*, 119, 1837–1858. doi:doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2008.11.008
- Kratzer, A. (1998). More structural analogies between pronouns and tenses. In D. Strolovitch & A. Lawson (Eds.), *Proceedings of semantics and linguistic theory conference 8* (pp. 92–110). Cambridge, MA: CLC Publications.
- Kratzer, A. (2005). Indefinites and the operators they depend on: From japanese to salish. In G. Carlson & F. Pelletier (Eds.), *Reference and quantification: The partee effect* (pp. 113–142). Chicago, IL: CSLI Publications.
- Kratzer, A. (2009). Making a pronoun: Fake indexicals as windows into the properties of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 40, 187–237. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1162/ling.2009.40.2.187>
- Ogihara, T. (1995). Double-access sentences and reference to states. *Natural Language Semantics*, 3, 177–210.
- Partee, B. (1989). Binding implicit variables in quantified contexts. In C. Wiltshire, R. Gazdár, & B. Music (Eds.), *Papers from cls 25* (pp. 342–365). Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Schlenker, P. (2004). Sequence phenomena and double access readings generalized. In A. Lecarme, J. Lecarme, & J. Guéron (Eds.), *The syntax of time* (pp. 555–597). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Schlenker, P. (2005). The lazy frenchman approach to subjunctive. In T. Geerts, I. van Ginniken, & H. Jacobs (Eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory* (pp. 269–310). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sode, F., & Truckenbrodt, H. (2018). Verb position, verbal mood, and root phenomena in german. In M. Antomo & S. Müller (Eds.), *Non-canonical verb positioning in main clauses. linguistische berichte sonderheft* (pp. 91–135). Hamburg: Buske.
- von Stechow, A. (1995). On the proper treatment of tense. In M. Simmons & T. Galloway (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 5th semantics and linguistic theory conference* (pp. 362–386). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.