

The verbal TAM paradigm: The role of mood

Maribel Romero

In the verbal Tense-Aspect-Mood (TAM) morphological paradigm, the received wisdom tell us that aspect morphology locates the event described by the VP with respect to a relevant time interval and that tense morphology locates this time interval in the past, present or future of the utterance time t_0 . But what exactly is the role of mood? Building on a long tradition (Farkas 1992, Giannakidou 1994, a.o.), literature on mood in Romance is converging on the idea that Indicative is associated with a simple Modal Base (MB) while Subjunctive is associated with a MB and Ordering Source (OS) (Giorgi & Pianesi 1997, Villalta 2008). However, current analyses disagree on the concrete implementation of this idea: some treat mood as introducing $\forall w$ -quantification, as in (1) (Portner & Rubinstein 2020, Alonso-Ovalle et al. 2024), while others treat mood as a world-pronoun, as in (2) (Romero 2024, cf. Schlenker 2005), where superscripted e refers to the anchor event and content(e) yields the modal background(s) invoked by this anchor event:

- (1) a. $[[\text{IND}^e]^g]$ Presupposition: content(e) consists of MB
Assertion: $\lambda p. \forall w \in \cap \text{MB} [p(w)]$
b. $[[\text{SUBJ}^e]^g]$ Presupposition: content(e) consists of MB+OS
Assertion: $\lambda p. \forall w \in \text{BEST}(\text{MB}, \text{OS}) [p(w)]$
- (2) a. $[[\text{IND}_2^e]^g]$ Presupposition: content(e) consists of MB and $g(2) \in \cap \text{MB}$
Assertion: $g(2)$
b. $[[\text{SUBJ}_2^e]^g]$ Presupposition: content(e) consists of MB+OS and $g(2) \in \text{BEST}(\text{MB}, \text{OS})$
Assertion: $g(2)$

The present talk examines modally interpreted relative clauses in Spanish, shows that the mood-as- $\forall w$ -quantification derives wrong truth conditions, and develops a mood-as-world-pronoun analysis that derives the correct predictions.

REFERENCES

- Alonso-Ovalle, L., P. Menéndez-Benito & A. Rubinstein. 2024. Eventive modal projection: the case of Spanish subjunctive relative clauses, *Natural Language Semantics* 32: 135-176.
- Farkas, D. 1992. On the semantics of subjunctive complements. In P. Hirschbühler & K. Koerner (eds.), *Romance Languages and Modern Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1994. The semantic licensing of NPIs and the modern Greek subjunctive. In *Language and cognition 4: Yearbook of the research group for theoretical and experimental linguistics*. 55–68. Groningen: University of Groningen.
- Giorgi, Alessandra & Fabio Pianesi. 1997. *Tense and Aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moulton, Keir. 2009. *Natural selection and the syntax of clausal complementation*, PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Portner, P. and A. Rubinstein. 2020. Desire, belief and semantic composition: Variation in mood selection with desire predicates, *Natural Language Semantics* 28: 343-393.
- Romero, M. 2024. Mood across constructions: a unified approach. In *SALT 34*, pp. 584-604.
- Schlenker, P. 2005. The Lazy Frenchman's Approach to the Subjunctive. *Proceedings of Going Romance XVII*.
- Villalta, Elisabeth. 2008. Mood and Gradability: an investigation of the subjunctive mood in Spanish. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31. 467–522.