

Licensing Future

Neda Todorović

University of British Columbia

This paper discusses peculiarity of future readings. It shows its aspectual pickiness in Serbian (SR): the perfective is not always allowed (verbs in SR are always aspectually marked). I show that the aspectual distribution is puzzling for the syntax-only/semantics-only account, and argue that it involves both components: the perfective is enabled by a covert modal/future element, which is independently syntactically licensed. The (im)possibility of the perfective reflects the presence/absence of the covert modal, thus revealing the modal-temporal domain constellation. Washo, St'á'timcets and Gitksan provide further support for the future-related element licensing.

In matrix clauses in SR, future interpretation is typically expressed with 'will' + an infinitive; both the imperfective (1a) and the perfective (1b) are permitted.

- (1) a. Ja ću pisati tezu. b. Ja ću napisati tezu i dobiti doktorat.
I will-1.sg. write-**impf**.inf thesis. I will-1.sg. write-**pf**.inf. thesis and get-**pf**.inf. PhD
'I will be writing my thesis.' 'I will complete the thesis and get my PhD.'

Future can also be expressed with a present tense form. Crucially, perfective is banned (2b). But, when the present tense form combines with 'will' + *da*, both aspects are felicitous (3).

- (2) a. Kupujem kola sutra. b. *Kupim kola sutra.
buy-**impf**.1.sg.pres car tomorrow buy-**pf**.1.sg.pres car tomorrow
'I am buying a car tomorrow.' 'I will buy a car tomorrow.'

- (3) On će sutra da kupuje / kupi kola.
he will tomorrow DA buy-**impf**.3.sg.pres. / buy-**pf**.3.sg.pres car
'He will be buying a car tomorrow.' (impf.) / 'He will buy a car tomorrow.' (pf.)

Embedded clauses typically use *da* + the present tense form. In complements of, e.g. 'want', the embedded present receives a future interpretation; both aspects are felicitous (4).

- (4) Želim da sutra jedem / pojdem dinju.
want-1.sg.pres DA tomorrow eat-**impf**.1.sg.pres. / eat-**pf**.1.sg.pres. melon
'I want to be eating a melon tomorrow.' (impf.) / 'I want to eat the entire melon tomorrow.' (pf.)

In propositional complements of, e.g. 'believe', a future interpretation of embedded present is available with the imperfective (5). Note a more general restriction with embed. present in these complements: non-generic episodic predicates cannot co-occur with the perfective even under the simultaneous interpretation (The restriction also holds with the present tense in simple clauses).

- (5) Verujem da Aca (sutra) kupuje / (sutra) *kupi kola.
believe-1.sg.pres. DA Aca tomorrow buy-**impf**.3sg.pres / tomorrow buys-**pf**.3.sg.pres car

Fut.: 'I believe that Aca will be buying a car tomorrow.' (impf.) / *'will buy a car tomorrow.' (pf.)

Simult.: 'I believe that Aca is buying a car right now.' (impf.) / *'has bought a car (just now)' (pf.)

Tenseless complements of e.g. 'try' are always interpreted simultaneously; both aspects are attested with the embedded present (6). The future interpretation is altogether excluded.

- (6) Pokušavam da (*sutra) prevodim / (*sutra) prevedem pesmu.
try.1sg.pres DA tomorrow translate.**impf**.1.sg.pres / tomorrow translate.**pf**.1.sg.pres poem
'I'm trying to translate a poem right now/*tomorrow.' (impf.) / to translate the entire poem *tomorrow. (pf.)

Perfective with future reading | root clauses with 'will' (1), (3), future-irrealis compl. (4).

Proposal: 1) **Perfective puzzle – semantic component:** Assuming the semantics of the perfective (7) – the inclusion of the event time in the reference time (RT) – aspectual restrictions are due to the tense-aspect interplay: the perfective is banned in contexts where the RT, dictated by the temporal domain above it, is very short (for English, see Parsons 1990, *i.a.*). In simple clauses with semantic present, which introduces the RT for the perfective, the RT is too short (given (8) + the tense is ordered with respect to the near-instantaneous UT ([UT [TP PRES [AspP pf.]]]]); the perfective is banned. In propositional complements, present tense is ordered with respect to the embed-

ded RT (the very short attitude holder's 'now') (*believe* [CP_{AH} NOW *da* [TP PRES [AspP_{pf}]]]). Given (8), this short interval is the RT for the perfective, which is correctly excluded in *simult.* contexts in (5).

(7)a. Pf: $\lambda P.\lambda t.\exists e(\text{time}(e)\subseteq t \& P(e)=1)$ b. Impf: $\lambda P.\lambda t.\exists e(t\subseteq \text{time}(e) \& P(e)=1)$ (Kratzer 1998)

(8) $\llbracket \text{PRESENT}_1 \rrbracket = \lambda p.\lambda t.\lambda w.\exists t_1[t_1 = t \& P(t_1)]$ (à la Pancheva and von Stechow 2004)

As is well known, morphological present in SR is not *per se* semantic present. I argue: when the perfective can occur with the present, it is due to a covert future element, a modal *woll* (see e.g. Abusch 1985). *Woll* quantifies over possible world-time pairs, giving the RT-extension for the perfective:

(9) $\llbracket \text{WOLL} \rrbracket_{\text{MB}} = \lambda P.\lambda w.\lambda t.\forall w' [w' \in \text{MB}(w,t) \rightarrow (\llbracket t, _ \rrbracket, w', P)]$ (Condoravdi 2002)

2) **Syntactic component:** Future component *woll*, I argue, requires syntactic licensing by an irrealis element. Assuming that **verbs selecting future complements** (semantic selec.) (4) have an irrealis feature, this feature must match with an irrealis/future complement via feature valuation

(10) (I show that future interp. comes from *woll*, not *want*). Perfective is also possible in questions (11a), where interrogative C has the irrealis feature (Givón 1995, i.a.), syntactically licensing the covert modal/future (11b), in turn providing the RT extension for the perfective. Felicitous perfective thus indicates that there is an independently licensed covert modal/future element.

(10) [... [VP *want* _{F:IRR} [ModP *woll* _{F:_}]]] (For a CP-less compl. in (10), see e.g. Stjepanović 2004)

(11) a. Da Vesna pročita ovu knjigu? b. [C _{F:IRR} [Mod *woll* _{F:_}]]

DA Vesna read.pf.3.sg.pres this book

'Should Vesna read this book?' (Vrzić 1996)

Tenseless complements (6), I argue, project just a VP (as shown by adverb distribution), and cannot host a covert modal; future readings are banned. Crucially, the adverb is not enough. Perfective is possible under *simult.* reading (6): 'try' has an intensional component (Sharvit 2003), extending the RT.

With overt future, *woll* is syntactically licensed (valued) by tense ($\llbracket \text{T}_{\text{F:PRES/PAST}} [\text{Mod } \text{WOLL}_{\text{F:}_}] \rrbracket$) (cf. English 'will' as _{PRES+}*woll* (Abusch 1985)), allowing the perfective in: canonical future (1), *će+da* (3) (also in propositional compl. with overt future), but not in (2b) and (5) which lack *woll* (imperf. might contain covert modal, hence the future reading (2a) (5)).

Consider now **future in Washo**. Bochnak (2016) shows that tense morph. is optional, and argues: those clauses have no tense features, only a temp. pronoun; context resolves their present/past reading (12). Crucially, 'tonight' cannot license future – a prospective marker *-aša?* can (13).

(12) Present (a): You just finished dinner, and everyone but Mona left the kitchen. You ask someone what she's up to now, they say (a) / Past (b): You just finished dinner; chicken was served, your favorite food.

a. Zí:gin hénuŋ Ø-guwáwa?-i-š-ge mó:na mí?le? Ø-gáma?-i b. Zí:gin di-gáma?-i

chicken little.bit 3-remain-IND-SR-OBJ.REL Mona all 3-eat.up-IND chicken 1-eat.up-IND

'Mona is eating up all the little bits of chicken that are left over.' 'I ate up the chicken.'

(13) Context: I ask you what the weather will be like later today.

a. #wá:diŋ dewp'áwit ø-há?aš-i b. wá:diŋ dewp'áwit ø-há?aš-aša?-i

today evening 3-rain-IND today evening 3-rain-PROSP-IND

Intended: 'It will rain tonight.' 'It is going to rain tonight.'

Tenseless clauses also get future reading in e.g. future plans (14); Bochnak argues: there is a covert modal operator _{PLAN}, which requires the syntactically represented temporal pronoun for its interpretation. Semantic-syntactic licensing of future will also be shown for morph. tenseless St'á'timcets and Gitksan: modal *kehl* and prosp. aspect *dim*, respectively, are needed for future, but are independently syntactically licensed by a non-future Tense (Matthewson 2006, 2013)).

(14) Hut'aŋahe:š mona ?-i:bik'-ha-i dewp'awid d-emlu-lewe.

what-Q Mona 3-be.cooked-CAUS-IND evening D.POSS-eat-for

(You want to know what Mona will cook for dinner later today) 'What will Mona prepare for dinner?'

To sum up, syntax-semantics analysis captures aspect-future interplay in SR: the perfective is enabled by an independently syntactically licensed covert future/modal component. Future reading licensing is also shown for Washo, St'á'timcets and Gitksan. **Sel. ref.:** Abusch, D.1985.On verbs and time.PhD Thesis,UMass. Bochnak,R.2016.Past time reference in a language with optional tense.Linguist and Philos.