

Simultaneous analyses for simultaneous present.

1. The question.

Sentences like (1) suggest that present tense is inherently indexical, denoting the temporal coordinate of the context parameter ((2),(3)). A puzzle for this view is that, across languages, embedded present tense can be used to convey “simultaneous” readings ((4)). Two kinds of accounts have been given for this that maintain that present is born as an indexical. On the *Tense Deletion* explanation (Ogihara 1996, cf Kratzer 1998), present can be converted into a simple bound variable when c-commanded by another present tense. On the *Shifting Indexical* explanation (e.g. Schlenker 2003), attitude verbs enable their complements to be evaluated with respect to a context whose time coordinate differs from that of the context of utterance. The former accounts well for simultaneous readings in English-type languages (assuming that *will* in examples like (4a) is a present tense form), but fails to account for Russian data like (4b) where there is no higher present tense. The second fares well for Russian-type languages but not for English data like (4a) where there is no attitude verb. Faced with these two accounts, one wonders: are two different mechanisms needed to account for “simultaneous present” ?

2. The answer.

Yes. A consideration of Romanian shows that both are needed (3). Moreover, the Romanian data have important consequences for what the *Shifting Indexical* analysis should look like (4).

3. The argument in brief.

In one dialect of Romanian (RA), we find “simultaneous present” in all of the environments where we find it in English, plus all of those where we find it in Russian. In another (RB), we find simultaneous readings in all the English-type environments, but if we look at the environments that permit “simultaneous present” in Russian but *not* in English, we find a complication: simultaneous readings are possible but come with a special condition on their use. On the two-mechanism view, we account simply for this typology, and in particular for the variation in Romanian. RA uses the English mechanism as well as the Russian mechanism. RB uses both as well, but in RB shifting is associated with a restriction that does not exist in RA.

4.Details: The non-commitment condition in RB and its theoretical consequences.

In RB, “simultaneous present” under past attitude verbs is associated with a *non-commitment condition* (NCC) which works basically as follows. Suppose a clause with present tense, S_{PRES} , expresses that property P holds of the utterance time. Then a speaker can *sometimes* use a sentence of the form $X \text{ verb-ed that } S_{PRES}$ to express that X attributed P to the time at which X located himself, but *cannot always* do so. A speaker is barred from doing so when she thinks that X was right and that P indeed held of the time at which X was located. Thus, in RB, we do not find “simultaneous present” under past factive verbs like *ști* (‘know’), whose use would commit the speaker to the claim that the embedded clause property held at the time of the attitude, but we do find it under verbs like *crede* (‘believe’). *Spune* (‘say/tell’) patterns with *crede* in a situation where the speaker does not know whether the embedded clause property held or not at the moment of saying ((5a)) or when the speaker knows that it did not ((5b)), but it behaves like a factive verb when the speaker considers herself to have evidence that the property held at the moment of saying, as in (6b), uttered by someone who takes Anca to be reliable about the local weather. (Table (7) summarizes. Similar facts seem to obtain in Hungarian and in German, cf. Rau 2009, but we don’t have a full description of the data.)

A “shifting indexical” analysis of simultaneous present under past RB attitude verbs crucially must link the presence of shifting to the introduction of the NCC. The link between shifting and the NCC suggests that there is a specific element that is responsible for shifting that fails to appear when there is no shifting, and that also contributes the NCC. Since the NCC concerns the evaluation time of the attitude verb, this element must in some manner “see” the embedding verb’s time argument. We thus propose that shifting is accomplished by a silent affix on the verb, which has the effect of “converting” the verb to an element that selects for a property of contexts. (8)-(10) sketches how this affix might work in RB (though we will also consider subtler analyses); the corresponding affix in RA would simply not have the partiality in its semantic value. Facts like the RB facts, we suggest, point to a picture on which indexical shifting is always mediated by verbal affixes. Facts like these cannot be captured naturally on approaches to indexical shifting like Schlenker 2003 (on which no specific element appears if and only if there is shifting) or Anand and Nevins 2004 (on which shifters never take as an argument either the verb or the verb’s time argument).

- Anand, P. and Nevins, A. 2004. "Shifty operators in changing contexts," *SALT 14*.
 Rau, J. 2009. "Semantic presuppositions and the German tense/mood system," Chronos talk.
 Schlenker, P. 2003. "A plea for monsters," *Linguistics and Philosophy*.