Explaining the Ambiguity of Embedded Past Tense Morphology

Carina Kauf[1] and Hedde Zeijlstra[1]

[1] *University of Goettingen*

Constructions in which a past tense is embedded under a matrix past tense have two readings: a simultaneous reading and a backward-shifted one. The availability of a simultaneous reading for past-under-past sentences is referred to as Sequence of Tense (SoT).

(1) John said Mary was ill.
   a. John, at some $t' <$ utterance time, t_u : "Mary is ill." (simultaneous reading)
   b. John, at some $t' < t_u$: "Mary was ill." (backward-shifted reading)

In all existing accounts, the simultaneous and the backward-shifted readings are derived via distinct mechanisms. Most of these implement the distinction as an ambiguity at the level of LF, assuming either a syntactic rule of tense deletion under certain conditions (Ogihara 1995; von Stechow 1995), a zero tense in the embedded clause (Kratzer 1998), a feature transfer mechanism that transmits temporal relations (Abusch 1997), or a combination of the last two (Grønn & von Stechow 2010), among others. However, the systematic availability of this ambiguity cross-linguistically casts doubt on whether it should indeed be attributed to two different LFs, instead of receiving a more principled explanation (see also Altshuler 2016; Altshuler & Schwarzschild 2012).

In this paper, we propose an alternative approach for SoT that avoids ambiguity. For us, the meaning of a past tense morpheme, like *-ed*, is comprised of two components. Syntactically, each past tense morpheme carries an uninterpretable past feature [uPAST] (henceforth [uP]), to be checked by a covert past tense operator *Op-PAST* that carries an interpretable feature [iPAST] (henceforth [iP]) of a structurally higher, absolutive past operator. (In this paper we restrict ourselves to temporal interpretations of past tense morphology, taking non-past, non-factual readings of past tense morphology out of consideration.) This past tense operator has the following denotation:

(2) $[\![\textit{Op-PAST}]\!] = [\ \lambda t^*.\ \lambda P.\ \exists t < t^*\ \&\ P(t)\ ]$

At matrix level, t^* usually applies to t_u. For reasons of readability, we will thus use t_u as the variable's default value in the derivations to come. Nevertheless, there will also be cases in which the value deviates from the default.

That past tense takes higher scope than the surface position of the past tense morpheme has been well-established in the literature (see von Stechow 2003; Stowell 2007; Zeijlstra 2012 for discussion). The standard assumption that this covert operator may only be included when it is grammatically necessary entails the operator's ability to check all of the uninterpretable past tense features in its syntactic domain (via multiple agree). Therefore, multiple past tense morphemes require the presence of only one past tense operator; vice versa, when one *Op-PAST* can check all present [uP] features, no second *Op-PAST* may be included.

A further novel contribution is our proposal that the past tense marker *-ed* is not semantically vacuous, but that it rather encodes a relative non-future with respect to its closest c-commanding tense node (informally: 'not later than'):

(3) $[\![$ -ed $]\!]$ = [$\lambda t.\ \lambda P.\ \exists t'.\ t' \leq t\ \&\ P(t')$]

This meaning component of past tense morphology ensures that every past tense embedded under another past is ambiguous between a simultaneous and a backward-shifted reading. The proposed configuration leads to a hierarchy of the tense nodes in a past sentence: The absolutive past tense operator places the sentence prior to the utterance time, thus providing the temporal head of the time chain, with all other past tense nodes expressing a relative non-future with respect to their closest c-commanding tense node. For an illustration, consider the following derivation:

(4) John said that Mary was ill.

a. [*Op-PAST*$_{[iP]}$ [John [say-ed$_{[uP]}$ [that [Mary [be-ed$_{[uP]}$ ill.]]]]]]
$\exists t' < t_u$ $\exists t^2 \leq t'$ $\exists t^3 \leq t^2$

b. $\exists t' < t_u$ & [$\exists t^2 \leq t'$ & say(John, t^2, [$\exists t^3 \leq t^2$ & be-ill(Mary, t^3)])]

The covert past tense operator in (4) places the proposition at some time $t' < t_u$. Since there are two past tense morphemes in the sentence, two relations of relative non-future have to be considered: t^2 is a relative non-future with respect to its closest c-commanding tense node, i.e. t', and t^3 is a relative non-future with respect to t^2. The backward-shifted reading of (4) arises in case that $t^3 < t^2$, the simultaneous interpretation is yielded for $t^3 = t^2$.

An important aspect of SoT is that past tense morphemes may even make reference to a time interval after the time of utterance. In (6) a past tense is used to describe the state of the fish's being alive, even though this time may lie after the utterance time. Our approach successfully captures the multiple interpretations of such 'fish-sentences' discussed in the literature (e.g. in Abusch 1988; Ogihara 1989; Heim 1994) under the assumption that *would* is a combination of the operator *woll* (a tense operator that places the evaluation time of a proposition in the relative future of the sentence's current evaluation time) plus a [uP] feature that restricts it to past tense sentences (again taking non-past, non-factual readings of *would* out of consideration here).

(5) $[\![$ would$_{[uP]}$ $]\!]$ = [$\lambda t.\ \lambda P.\ \exists t'.\ t' > t\ \&\ P(t')$]

(6) John said he would buy a fish that was still alive.

a. [*Op-PAST*$_{[iP]}$ [John [say-ed$_{[uP]}$ [he [would$_{[uP]}$ [buy a fish [that be-ed$_{[uP]}$ alive.]]]]]]]
$\exists t' < t_u$ $\exists t^2 \leq t'$ $\exists t^3 > t^2$ $\exists t^4 \leq t^3$

b. $\exists x$ [fish(x) & $\exists t' < t_u.\ \exists t^2 \leq t'$: say(John, t^2, [$\exists t^3 > t^2$: buy(he, t^3, x) & $\exists t^4 \leq t^3$: alive(y, t^4)])]

The explanation we propose has several advantages over existing approaches. It forgoes having to assume two different LFs, which correctly predicts the systematic ambiguity of past-under-past constructions across SoT-languages. Furthermore, the intra-morphemic anchoring of the ambiguity provides a key aspect of the theory's solution to several challenges that have been raised for ambiguity analyses. First, in her pioneering proposal, Abusch (1997) assumes that feature transmission (leading to the SoT effect) only arises with intensional embeddings – a claim that appears to be too strong. As has been illustrated in (4), the analysis we propose also applies to extensional embeddings since the simultaneous reading appears both under intensional an extensional predicates. Secondly, in order to rule out an unwanted forward shift of past-under-past embeddings (Mary's illness in (4) cannot have started later than at t^2 even with a de re interpretation), Abusch assumes the Upper Limit Constraint (ULC), a mechanism which restricts the reference of the embedded tense to a time prior or equal to the attitude holder's now. Formulated as a semantic mechanism, the ULC should apply universally to SoT languages. However, Ogihara and Sharvit (2012) show that some SoT languages do not have the ULC. The approach proposed here circumvents this unwanted prediction by hard-wiring the constraint of non-futurativity directly in the semantics of the past tense morpheme. Finally, since SoT requires feature checking by *Op-PAST* in the same syntactic domain when receiving an appositive, de re interpretation, the deviant be-

havior of past-under-past in (non-restrictive) relative clauses receives a proper explanation as well. Since uninterpretable features inside such relative clauses cannot be checked by features outside these clauses (see also Stowell 2007), as they form a separated syntactic domain, a second *Op-PAST* needs be included for these cases. Consequently, the two time variables in (7) need to be evaluated independently with respect to the time of utterance:

(7) Mary met a woman who was president.

a. [*Op-PAST*$_{[iP]}$ [Mary meet-ed$_{[uP]}$ a woman [who [*Op-PAST*$_{[iP]}$ [be-ed$_{[uP]}$ president]]]]]
$\exists t' < t_u$ $\exists t^2 \leq t'$ $\exists t'' < t_u$ $\exists t^3 \leq t''$

b. $\exists x$ [woman(x) & $\exists t' < t_u$. $\exists t^2 \leq t'$: meet(Mary, x, t^2) & $\exists t'' < t_u$. $\exists t^3 \leq t''$: president(x, t^3)]

To conclude, this approach to past tense systematically assigns both simultaneous and backward-shifted readings to past-under-past constructions. The semantic component (*-ed* is a relative non-future), next to the syntactic component of carrying an uninterpretable past feature defines the English past tense morpheme. Note that the existence of such parameters opens up a space for variation, which is where we expect variation cross-linguistically.