
Depending on the Future: The Speaker Changes her Perspective

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter I consider a challenging set of data: the dependencies from a future verbal form. So far, I have proposed that in Italian and English, both DAR languages, an embedded context requires that the subject's coordinate be syntactically represented. Recall that, as discussed in Chapter 2, anchoring to the subject temporal coordinate is obligatory in all languages when depending on an attitude predicates.

In certain cases—in indicative-like contexts—the speaker's coordinates are represented as well and the DAR arises. Some verbal forms, such as the (Italian and English) present perfect/simple past, future and present, require that the embedded eventuality with which they are associated be located with respect to both sets of coordinates, as opposed to the Italian subjunctive, as discussed in chapters 2 and 3.¹

Other verbal forms, such as the Italian imperfect of the indicative, to some extent the English past, and the future-in-the-past, are not to be located with respect to both sets of coordinates, given that they do not have to be valued with respect to the speaker's coordinate, being non-relational verbal forms. Consequently, as proposed in Chapter 4, they do not give rise to a DAR interpretation, even if the embedded contexts are in every respect identical to the DAR ones.

In all the examples discussed in the preceding chapters, however, the main verbal form is a present or a past tense one. In particular,

¹ For an analysis of the future in Romance, both in synchrony and in diachrony, see Fleischmann (2009).

I have not considered superordinate sentences with a future. The reason is that the contexts created by a future constitute a systematic exception to all the generalizations proposed so far. For instance, a present tense sentence embedded under a future—such as *Mary is pregnant*—discussed as a prototypical case of DAR in Italian and English in Chapter 2, is no longer interpreted with the DAR.

The aim of this chapter, however, is to show that simply claiming that there is no DAR in dependence on a future is not the correct way of looking at the facts. As soon as we enlarge the empirical basis, considering for instance the compatibility of the embedded verbal with temporal locutions of various kinds, the picture changes and does not turn out to be *exceptional* any longer.

5.2 Dependencies from a future tense

One might expect the properties of the verbal forms embedded under a main future to be the mirror image of what is observed under a main past. This is not what happens, though.

Consider first the case of an embedded present tense:

- (1) (Domani, quando gli porterai il caffè,) Gianni dirà che c'è poco zucchero
(Tomorrow, when you will take him the coffee,) Gianni will say that there
is too little sugar

The obvious interpretation, by far the most natural, is that the embedded state only holds at the time of the saying—namely, in the future with respect to the utterance time. For this sentence to be felicitous there is no need for the sugar to be *already* in the coffee, when the speaker utters the sentence. In other words, the embedded state does not hold at utterance time, but only at the time of the saying. Consequently, there is no DAR, which typically requires the embedded eventuality to hold at both times. Sentence (1) contrasts with sentence (2):

- (2) (Ieri) Gianni ha detto che c'è poco zucchero nel caffè
(Yesterday) Gianni said that there is too little sugar in the coffee

Sentence (2) has a DAR interpretation: the speaker is reporting about the situation of the sugar in the coffee both at the time Gianni said

the sentence and at the time the speaker is uttering it. In other words, sentence (2) implies that the sugar was put in the coffee yesterday and that we are still talking about the same coffee, still with too little sugar in it.²

Consider now an embedded past verbal form:

- (3) (Domani, quando gli porterai il caffè,) Gianni dirà che ci hai messo poco zucchero
(Tomorrow, when you will take him the coffee,) Gianni will say that you put(PRES PERF) in it too little sugar

In this case, as in sentence (1), the most natural interpretation is that the sugar is *not* in the coffee at the time of the utterance, but that it will be by the time the coffee is given to Gianni. That is, the embedded event is interpreted as past only with respect to Gianni's saying, but not with respect to the utterance event; therefore there is no DAR interpretation.

Prima facie, therefore, as far as the DAR is concerned, the verbal forms depending on a future exhibit the same properties as an imperfect, in that they are only located with respect to the speaker's coordinate.³

For completeness, consider now an example featuring an embedded future:

- (4) Gianni dirà che Maria partirà presto
Gianni will say that Maria will(FUT) leave soon

² Consider also the following contrast in English, suggested to me by J. Guéron:

- i. In two years, John will say/claim that Mary is pregnant
This sentence clearly contrasts with the following one.
ii. *Two years ago, John said/claimed that Mary is pregnant
It is clear that in the first case, Mary is not pregnant *now*.

³ They differ from a subjunctive, in that the latter agrees with the main verb, whereas no agreement is detectable in this case. Note also that the subjunctive is ungrammatical in these contexts, as expected:

- i. *Gianni dirà che Maria parta/partisse
Gianni will say that Maria leave(PRES SUBJ/PAST SUBJ)

This is relevant for an account of the dependencies from a future. It cannot be said that they give rise to an *irrealis* context—whatever this might mean—given that they do not admit the verbal form that is usually taken to express *irrealis* modality. As discussed by Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) and Giorgi (2009), I do share this view about the subjunctive and I also do not think it might be relevant for future dependencies, also given the very clear judgement in (i).

In this case, the leaving of Maria is located in the future with respect to Gianni's saying and therefore, *a fortiori*, after the utterance event. Notice that it is not possible to locate the embedded event in the future *only* with respect to the utterance time—i.e., in between the utterance event and the main event of saying. I will come back to this point in section 5.3 below.

Interestingly, an embedded imperfect can appear under a future, as well:

- (5) (Domani, quando gli porterai il caffè,) Gianni dirà che ci avevi messo poco zucchero
(Tomorrow, when you will take him the coffee,) Gianni will say that you had (IMPF) put in it too little sugar.

Notice also that I observed above—cf. Chapter 4—that the imperfect has the role of *neutralizing* the DAR. That is, by means of the imperfect morphology, the embedded event is located only with respect to the subject's coordinate and not with respect to the speaker's, being specified as an *anti-speaker* form. Given the discussion above, about the absence of DAR effects, one might wonder, then, what the role of the imperfect might be in cases such as (5), which so far seem totally redundant with respect to those such as (3). I will consider the issue again in section 5.4.

Concluding these observations, it is possible to say that the context created by a main future has different properties with respect to the one created by a main past. The embedded eventuality has to be located only with respect to the main event and not with respect to the utterance event, even in the case of an embedded present tense. In other words, apparently, in these cases there is no DAR.

Note that as far as the syntactic properties are concerned, the future-depending contexts pattern with indicative contexts and not with subjunctive ones. As shown above, in chapters 2 and 3, we can use Complementizer Deletion as a test. In Italian, in some cases it is possible to omit the Complementizer introducing subjunctive clauses, but not the one introducing indicative ones. Consider the following examples:

- (6) Gianni credeva (che) tu fossi partito ieri
Gianni believed (that) you had(SUBJ) left yesterday
- (7) Gianni ha detto *(che) tu sei partito ieri
Gianni said (that) you left yesterday

The Complementizer cannot be omitted in example (6), contrasting with (7). In the contexts depending from a future it cannot be omitted either:

- (8) Gianni dirà *(che) sei partito ieri
Gianni will say that you left yesterday

These contexts therefore exhibit the standard syntactic properties of the indicative ones.

Concluding these preliminary remarks, the problem is constituted by the fact that the DAR, in the account I am arguing for in this book, is due to two factors. First, a verb of saying, as opposed for instance to a verb of wishing, selects for the subordinate clause an undeletable Complementizer endowed with the speaker's coordinate. Second, conversely, an embedded indicative, such as an Italian present perfect, a simple past, or a present tense, necessarily requires such a Complementizer. The verbal form must therefore obligatorily be evaluated with respect to the speaker's coordinate. Given that the main verb selects an undeletable Complementizer and that the embedded verbal form is an ordinary indicative, as shown in examples (2) and (3), the DAR is expected to arise, but apparently it does not.

In what follows I will show that as soon as other properties are considered, even the contexts created by a main future turn out to pattern with DAR ones—i.e., the speaker's coordinate is represented in the C-layer. Therefore the problem will be reduced to the following: given that the speaker's temporal coordinate is there, how come that in sentences such as (2) and (3) the embedded event seems not to be located with respect to *now*, but only with respect to the saying?

5.3 The distribution of temporal locutions

An interesting piece of evidence that will be shown to clarify the issue comes from the distribution of temporal adverbs in these contexts. The distribution and interpretation of such locutions point to the conclusion that the contexts created by a past tense and the one created by a future are not symmetrical.

Roughly speaking, it is possible to distinguish three kinds of temporal locutions: the referential ones (such as *il 23 maggio 1997* (23 May 1997), *ottobre 2004* (October 2004), etc.), the indexical ones (such as *ieri* (yesterday), *domani* (tomorrow), *questa mattina* (this morning), *tre ore fa* (three hours ago), etc.), and the anaphoric ones (*il giorno prima/dopo* (the day before/after), *tre ore prima/dopo* (three hours before/after), etc.).⁴

In the first group, the temporal reference is *built into* the expression itself. For the second group it is supplied by the indexical context—i.e., the context surrounding the utterance event. For the third group it is supplied by the linguistic context—i.e., the information provided by the sentence or the discourse.

5.3.1 Referential locutions

The locutions of the first group are compatible with all tenses and moods. Consider the following examples:⁵

⁴ There is also a fourth type of expression, which I dub *incomplete* temporal locutions: *il 23 maggio* (23 May), *giovedì alle 7* (Thursday at 7). The reference to a specific month or day is not *complete* in the sense that in order to be uniquely identified more information must be supplied by the context. For instance in the case of a locution such as *il 23 maggio*, the year should be supplied; in the case of *giovedì alle 7* (Thursday at 7), the week of the year. It seems to me however that this case is no different from that of a proper name. To exemplify, the proper name *Alessandra Giorgi* does not uniquely identify a referent in the world, being quite a frequent one. The information, however, is pragmatically supplied. The readers of this work, for instance, will have no difficulty in identifying who the actual referent is, given this particular context. In general, therefore, the rigidity of proper names can be maintained. Concluding, incomplete temporal locutions can be assimilated to referential ones, as far as the properties discussed in this chapter are concerned. See also Giorgi and Pianesi (2003) and Bertinetto and Bianchi (1993).

⁵ The use of a referential temporal locution with a present tense is slightly odd:

- i. ?Gianni ha detto che il 26 dicembre Maria è felice
Gianni said that on 26 December Maria is happy

The reason for this oddness is presumably a pragmatic redundancy. The sentence becomes more natural if the temporal expression is used as an appositive to the indexical one:

- ii. Gianni ha detto che oggi, 26 dicembre, Maria è felice
Gianni said that today, 26 December, Maria is happy

I do not consider this issue in this work. Another question that I am not going to address concerns the sentence initial or sentence final position of the temporal adverb. Though important for the interpretation of the sentences, it does not seem to me to be relevant here.

- (9) Gianni ha detto che Maria è partita il 26 dicembre
Gianni said that Maria left on 26 December
- (10) Gianni ha detto che Maria partirà il 26 dicembre
Gianni said that Maria will leave on 26 December
- (11) Gianni ha detto che Maria sarebbe partita il 26 dicembre
Gianni said that Maria would leave on 26 December

In these examples the main verb is a past form. The temporal locution is available with an embedded past, a future, and a future-in-the-past. An embedded imperfect gives rise to the same result:

- (12) Gianni ha detto che il 26 dicembre Maria era a Parigi
Gianni said that on 26 December Maria was(IMP)F in Paris
- (13) Gianni ha detto che Maria era partita il 26 dicembre
Gianni said that Maria had(IMP)F left on 26 December

If the main verb selects a subjunctive in the embedded clause, like a verb of *belief*, the result does not change:

- (14) Gianni credeva che Maria partisse il 26 dicembre
Gianni believed that Maria left(SUBJ) on 26 December
- (15) Gianni credeva che Maria fosse partita il 26 dicembre
Gianni believed that Maria had(SUBJ) left on 26 December

Finally, the referential locution is available with *credere* (believe) and the future-in-the-past as well:

- (16) Gianni credeva che Maria sarebbe partita il 26 dicembre
Gianni believed that Maria would leave on 26 December

It is not surprising, therefore, that it is available when the main verbal form is a future tense:

- (17) Gianni dirà che Maria è partita il 26 dicembre
Gianni will say that Maria left on 26 December
- (18) Gianni dirà che Maria partirà il 26 dicembre
Gianni will say that Maria will leave on 26 December

Consistently with what has been observed in the previous section, the locution must be compatible with Sequence of Tense properties. For instance, if we add in example (19) a temporal specification on the superordinate clause, it must refer to a time following the one of the embedded clause:

- (19) Il 28/*24 dicembre Gianni ha detto che Maria è partita il 26
 On the 28th/*24th of December Gianni said that Maria left on the 26th

Given that the embedded event must precede the utterance event, the locution *on the 24th of December* is not available in the main clause. A case such as the following is analogous:

- (20) Il 24/*28 dicembre Gianni ha detto che Maria partirà il 26
 On the 24th/*28th of December Gianni said that Maria will leave on the 26th

This case is the mirror image of the one given above, so that the time of the saying must precede that of the leaving.

Notice, finally, that everything must be compatible with the utterance time. Namely, for a sentence such as (19) to be felicitous, the utterance event must be located after the 28th of December. For (20) to be felicitous, the utterance event must be located in between the saying, on the 24th, and the leaving, on the 26th, and therefore for instance on the 25th.

The same computations hold in the case of the dependencies from a main future. Therefore, it is possible to add to sentence (17) the following temporal specifications:

- (21) Il 28/*24 dicembre Gianni dirà che Maria è partita il 26
 On 28/*24 December Gianni will say that Maria left on the 26th

As observed above, the time of the leaving must precede the time of the saying. Therefore, the 28th of December is a possible temporal specification, whereas the 24th is not. Consider now the following example, corresponding to the sentence given in (20) above:

- (22) Il 24 dicembre Gianni dirà che Maria partirà il 26
 On 24 December Gianni will say that Maria will leave on the 26th

In this case, the leaving event must follow the saying, and therefore given that the saying takes place on the 24th of December, the leaving can occur on the 26th.

Consider now the location of the utterance event. With respect to the example (22), trivially, it must precede the saying and therefore the leaving. Consequently, it must occur prior to the 24th of December.

With respect to the example in (21), the situation is more interesting. The saying event must follow the utterance event, being with

future morphology. The location of the embedded event—i.e., of the leaving—is only relative to the saying. Therefore, the utterance event can either be placed in between the two, for instance on the 27th of December—i.e., before the saying and after the leaving—or before both events. For instance, if today is the 25th of December, I can still place the saying on the 28th and the leaving on the 26th. This is coherent with the observations on example (3) above, repeated here for simplicity:

- (23) (Domani, quando gli porterai il caffè,) Gianni dirà che ci hai messo poco zucchero
(Tomorrow, when you will take him the coffee,) Gianni will say that you put(PRES PERF) in it too little sugar

5.3.2 *Indexical temporal locutions*

Indexical temporal locutions, like all indexicals, are taken to be *rigid* (see Kaplan 1989)—namely, to identify always the same items independently of the semantic and syntactic domain in which they are used. Here I sketch the distribution of these elements in main and embedded clauses.

In main clauses indexical temporal locutions must be coherent with the verbal form:

- (24) Gianni è partito ieri/*domani
Gianni left yesterday/*tomorrow
- (25) Gianni partirà domani/*ieri
Gianni will leave tomorrow/*yesterday

Indexical temporal locutions can appear in embedded clauses both with indicative and subjunctive verbal forms. Let's consider the indicative first:

- (26) Questa mattina Gianni ha detto che Maria è partita ieri/*domani
This morning Gianni said that Maria left yesterday/*tomorrow

In this sentence, the embedded event precedes the saying, which in turn precedes the utterance event. Trivially, therefore, an indexical placing the embedded event in the future, such as *domani* (tomorrow), cannot be compatible with the embedded clause.

Furthermore, a locution appearing in the superordinate clause must be compatible with the correct sequencing of the events. For instance, the following sentence is not felicitous:

- (27) *Ieri Gianni ha detto che Maria è partita stamattina
Yesterday Gianni said that Maria left this morning

Due to the obligatoriness of temporal anchoring, as discussed in Chapter 2, a past under a past yields the interpretation according to which the embedded event precedes the main one and *both* precede the utterance event. The same considerations apply to the embedded future:

- (28) Questa mattina Gianni ha detto che Maria partirà domani/*ieri
This morning Gianni said that Maria will leave tomorrow/*yesterday
- (29) *Domani Gianni ha detto che Maria partirà questa mattina
*Tomorrow Gianni said that Maria will leave this morning

In these cases, the leaving event must follow both the saying and the utterance event in this sequencing: saying event > utterance event > leaving event and the temporal locutions must be coherent with this interpretation.

An embedded *futurate*—i.e., a present tense with a future interpretation—exhibits the expected properties as well:

- (30) Questa mattina Gianni ha detto che Maria parte domani/*ieri
This morning Gianni said that Maria leaves tomorrow/*yesterday
- (31) *Domani Gianni ha detto che Maria parte questa mattina
*Tomorrow Gianni said that Maria leaves this morning

Sentences (30) and (31) parallel examples (28) and (29).

Note that in all the cases listed above, ungrammaticality is due to syntax, in particular to the requirement concerning the obligatoriness of anchoring in attitude contexts. If such a requirement did not exist, all the sentences above would be well formed.

The future-in-the-past does not raise any special problem, given that the embedded event might either precede or follow the utterance event:

- (32) Questa mattina Gianni ha detto che Maria sarebbe partita ieri/domani
This morning Gianni said that Maria would leave yesterday/tomorrow

When the embedded verbal form is a subjunctive one, all indexicals are available for locating the embedded event, as discussed in Chapter 2:⁶

- (33) Gianni credeva che Maria partisse ieri/oggi/domani
Gianni believed that Maria left (PAST SUBJ) yesterday/today/tomorrow

Recall that in these cases, the embedded event does not need to be located with respect to the utterance time, in that subjunctive contexts do not enforce the DAR, contrasting with the indicative ones.

In the same vein, if the embedded form is an imperfect, all indexicals are equally available:⁷

- (34) Gianni ha detto che Maria partiva ieri/oggi/domani
Gianni said that Maria left (IMPF) yesterday/today/tomorrow

Therefore, it is possible to conclude that indexical temporal locutions can appear both in DAR and in non-DAR contexts.

Consider now what happens when a past tense is embedded under a future:

- (35) Gianni dirà che Maria è partita ieri
Gianni will say that Maria left yesterday

As expected, this sentence is grammatical, and does not raise any special problem. The leaving occurs before the saying and, as specified by the indexical adverb *ieri* (yesterday), also before the utterance time. However, the embedded event does not necessarily have to precede the utterance one. Compare example (36) with example (21):

- (36) Il 28 dicembre Gianni dirà che Maria è partita il 26
On 28 December Gianni will say that Maria left on the 26th

⁶ Note that for aspectual reasons *partisse oggi* is interpreted as a futurate. However, if the embedded eventuality is a state, such an interpretation disappears:

- i. Gianni credeva che oggi Maria fosse felice
Gianni believed that today Maria (PAST SUBJ) is happy

In this case, the state of happiness overlaps with the time of Gianni's belief.

⁷ In this example the imperfect conveys a *modal* meaning, to the effect that *Maria intended to leave, or was supposed to leave*. A discussion of this topic would lead me too far away, therefore I will abstract here from these interpretive properties, which however do not seem to have any consequence for the specific question discussed in this chapter.

I pointed out above that this sentence can be uttered on the 25th of December—namely at a time preceding both the saying and the leaving, which in turn is past with respect to the saying. The ordering of the events is therefore utterance event > leaving > saying.

Interestingly, the following example is totally unacceptable, even if *today* is the 25th.⁸

- (37) *Il 28 dicembre Gianni dirà che Maria è partita domani
 *On 28 December Gianni will say that Maria left tomorrow

On the one hand, *tomorrow* rigidly refers to the day after the utterance. On the other, the embedded past locates the leaving event in the past with respect to the saying event, but does not locate it anywhere with respect to the utterance one, as illustrated above. That is, in the sentence *Il 28 dicembre Gianni dirà che Maria è partita* (On the 28th of December, Gianni will say that Maria left) the leaving does not necessarily precede the utterance time, but must only be located prior to the saying. Consequently, the sentence should in principle be possible, *tomorrow* in the above scenario being compatible with such a reading. This reading, however, is not available.

In other words, the leaving *is* placed *tomorrow*—i.e., in the day after the utterance according to the speaker's point of view—but this meaning can be expressed by means of sentence (36), but not by means of sentence (37).

One might claim that this is due to the simple fact that, for whatever reason, the sequence *past tense + tomorrow* yields ungrammaticality, as happens in main clauses:

- (38) *Gianni è partito domani
 Gianni left yesterday

Yet it is far from clear why this should be the case, i.e., why (37) should be ungrammatical for the same reason as (38). After all, (38) is

⁸ In the following chapter about Free Indirect Discourse, I will consider some cases in which the sequence *past tense + tomorrow* is perfectly acceptable. Consider for instance the following case, discussed in Chapter 6:

- i. **Tomorrow was** Monday, Monday, the beginning of another school week!

The very existence of this example shows that the sequence is indeed available, provided that there is a suitable context. See below for discussion.

ungrammatical because *tomorrow* places the event in the future of the speaker, whereas the verbal form places it in her past, yielding a contradiction. But this is not the case with respect to (37).

One might answer to this that the phenomenon in question might be regarded as a simple mismatch of features, *left* being marked as [+past] and *tomorrow* being marked as [–past]. However, this explanation cannot hold either. Consider in fact that the same evidence can be reproduced with nominal constructions, as in the following example:

- (39) Dopodomani Gianni dirà che [la tua partenza di domani] è stata necessaria
The day after tomorrow Gianni will say that your leaving tomorrow was necessary
- (40) Gianni dirà che [la tua partenza di domani] è necessaria
The day after tomorrow Gianni will say that your leaving tomorrow is necessary
- (41) *Dopodomani Gianni dirà che [la tua partenza di domani] è necessaria
The day after tomorrow Gianni will say that your leaving tomorrow is necessary

In these examples the indexical *tomorrow* refers to a leaving event, which is expressed by means of a nominal, *partenza* (the leaving). These examples show that the impossibility of *tomorrow* in sentences such as (41) is not just a matter of trivial *incompatibility* between a certain verbal form and an indexical adverb, but that it depends on the specific configuration and its properties. I will consider these sentences again below. Consider now the following cases:

- (42) *Dopodomani Gianni dirà che Maria partirà domani
The day after tomorrow Gianni will say that Maria will leave tomorrow
- (43) Gianni dirà che Maria partirà domani
Gianni will say that Maria will leave tomorrow
- (44) Dopodomani Gianni dirà che Maria partirà
The day after tomorrow Gianni will say that Maria will leave

Sentence (44) expresses the following meaning: *the day after tomorrow Gianni will announce the leaving of Maria*, which in turn lies in the future with respect to the saying—and, consequently, the utterance event. The sequence obtained is the following: utterance event > saying (on the day after tomorrow) > leaving. Sentence (43) means that at

some point, placed between the utterance event and tomorrow, Gianni will announce Maria's leaving, which lies in the future with respect to the saying and the utterance event. The sequence is therefore: utterance event > saying > leaving (tomorrow). The generalization holding in this case seems to be that *partirà* must be a future with respect both to the saying event and the utterance event. Consequently, it cannot be located between the two.⁹

Concluding, in this section I pointed out two sources of unacceptability. The first one concerns the distribution of embedded indexicals, as illustrated by means of the distribution of *domani* (tomorrow). The second one concerns the relative location of events, as illustrated by the examples (42)–(44). In section 5.3 I address these issues and propose an explanation.

5.3.3 *Anaphoric temporal locutions*

In this section I briefly sketch the main phenomena having to do with the distribution of this kind of locution. I will consider the topic in greater detail in section 5.4.2.2.

In general, these locutions need an antecedent in the previous discourse or in the sentence. Consider the following discourse:

- (45) A: Maria è partita il 23 marzo B: Ma no! È partita il giorno prima
A: Maria left on 23 March B: No! She left the day before

Without the background provided by A, the sentence in B would be unacceptable. This might be considered as a trivial case of anaphoricity: if there is no antecedent for x in ' e before x '—where e is the given event, and x is the variable to be saturated—the structure is not acceptable.

⁹ The same effects are found with an embedded futurate-present:

- i. Dopodomani Gianni dirà che Maria parte
The day after tomorrow Gianni will say that Maria leaves
- ii. Gianni dirà che Maria parte domani
Gianni will say that Maria leaves tomorrow

In this case as well, the leaving event cannot be located in between the utterance event and the main event of saying. That is, the ordering cannot be: utterance event > leaving > saying, but must be: utterance event > saying > leaving.

However, consider again the simple unacceptable case, uttered *out of the blue*:

- (46) # Maria è partita il giorno prima
 Maria left the day before

The claim that in the out of the blue situation the context provides no antecedent for *x* is not totally correct, however. The utterance event is in fact in principle available, as we know given the interpretation of the tense on the verb, which locates the leaving in the past with respect to the utterance. Giorgi and Pianesi (2003) addressed this question and proposed that the utterance event, though available, is incompatible with these expressions.¹⁰

These considerations will prove relevant in the analysis I propose in the following sections, and I address this issue again below. For the time being, let me point out that sentence (46) cannot mean *Maria left the day before the day of utterance*. If the speaker wants to express precisely this meaning, she must use the indexical expression:

- (47) Maria è partita ieri
 Maria left yesterday

One might claim that the anaphoric locution is disfavoured because the indexical one is available. Therefore, sentence (47) is favoured over (46) and chosen when possible.¹¹

Consider now the dependencies from a future, in particular, the structure expressing the sequence of events given in examples (36) and (37): utterance event > leaving > saying. I have already shown that the presence of an indexical for placing the embedded event of leaving is impossible—cf. example (37), repeated here:

- (48) *Il 28 dicembre Gianni dirà che Maria è partita domani
 On 28 December Gianni will say that Maria left tomorrow

¹⁰ For a discussion of the reason of the incompatibility, see Giorgi and Pianesi (2003).

¹¹ This, however, is not the case, but only a simplification for the sake of the present argument. See the text below for an analysis. See also Giorgi and Pianesi (2003) for a comprehensive discussion of the phenomena involved with this kind of temporal locution.



One might expect the anaphoric locution to be available, contrary to facts:

- (49) *Il 28 dicembre/dopodomani Gianni dirà che Maria è partita il giorno prima
On 28 December/the day after tomorrow Gianni will say that Maria left the day before

The impossibility holds whether we find a referential temporal locution in the main clause—*il 28 dicembre*—or an indexical one—*dopodomani*.

If the embedded verbal form is an imperfect, then the anaphoric locution becomes available:

- (50) Il 28 dicembre/dopodomani Gianni dirà che Maria era partita il giorno prima
On 28 December/the day after tomorrow Gianni will say that Maria had(IMP) left the day before

This sentence clearly contrasts with the one given above. Contrasts of this sort are found systematically, even with main past forms. Consider the following examples, where a past verbal form is embedded under a past:

- (51) *Ieri Gianni ha detto che Mario è partito il giorno prima
Yesterday Gianni said that Mario left the day before
- (52) *Il 23 maggio Gianni ha detto che Mario è partito il giorno prima
On 23 May Gianni said that Mario left the day before

In these cases the judgement is as in (49). Analogously to what we saw above, the presence of the imperfect makes the sentence grammatical:

- (53) Ieri/il 23 maggio Gianni ha detto che Mario era partito il giorno prima
Yesterday/on 23 May Gianni said that Mario left the day before

The same pattern obtains with a future embedded under a future:

- (54) *Il 28 dicembre/dopodomani Gianni dirà che Maria partirà 2 giorni dopo/da lì a due giorni
On 28 December/the day after tomorrow Gianni will say that Maria will leave two days after



- (55) Il 28 dicembre/dopodomani Gianni dirà che Maria sarebbe partita 2 giorni dopo/da lì a due giorni
On 28 December/the day after tomorrow Gianni will say that Maria would leave two days after¹²

Again, in this case the verb embedded under a future tense behaves on a par with a verb embedded under a past tense:

- (56) *(Ieri) Gianni ha detto che Mario partirà due giorni dopo
(Yesterday) Gianni said that Mario will leave two days after
- (57) *Il 23 maggio Gianni ha detto che Mario partirà 8 giorni dopo (oggi è il 26 maggio)
On 23 May Gianni said that Mario will leave 8 days after (today is 26 May)

The sentence becomes grammatical if a future-in-the-past appears in the embedded clause:¹³

- (58) (Ieri) Gianni ha detto che Mario sarebbe partito due giorni dopo
(Yesterday) Gianni said that Mario would leave two days after
- (59) Il 23 maggio Gianni ha detto che sarebbe partito 8 giorni dopo
On 23 May Gianni said that he would leave 8 days after

As I briefly discussed in section 5.2.1, the imperfect and the future-in-the-past do not require the embedded event to be located with respect to the utterance event, whereas the ‘normal’ indicative forms do. Simplifying somehow, Giorgi and Pianesi’s (2003) generalization concerning the distribution of anaphoric temporal locutions is the following:

- (60) Anaphoric temporal locutions cannot be used for locating events which are in a direct relation R with the utterance event

This generalization captures both the observation in main clauses and the data concerning the clauses depending on a past.

Concluding this section, a (non-imperfect) indicative form embedded under a future follows the ‘normal’ pattern. That is, the form *è partita* (has left/left) embedded under a future behaves with

¹² The locution *da lì a due giorni* (lit: from then to two days after, ‘after two days’), is an anaphoric locution identifying the moment in which the event can possibly occur. In some sense it is equivalent to ‘not earlier than’.

¹³ Higginbotham (p.c.) pointed out that the temporal locutions with *ago*—as for instance *two months ago*—are for some speakers anaphoric, whereas for others they are indexical. For this reason, I avoid using this kind of locution here.

respect to anaphoric temporal locutions exactly like *è partita* (has left/left) under a past tense.

This fact is surprising, given that *è partita* depending from a future does not need to be located with respect to the utterance event—cf. section 5.2. Therefore, it should not fall under generalization (60) and should be compatible with an anaphoric temporal locution. The distribution of anaphoric temporal locutions is expected to parallel the one found with the imperfect and the future-in-the-past, contrary to facts. In the next section I propose a solution to this puzzle.

5.4 Towards an explanation

The hypothesis I develop in this section capitalizes on the last consideration of the preceding section: *è partita* under a future behaves like *è partita* under a past. Coherently with this observation, it might be worth exploring the idea that, contrary to appearances, the context created by a main future has the same properties as the context created by a main past. On the other hand, DAR effects are not the same in the two cases, as shown in section 5.2, and therefore something must account for this fact.

5.4.1 DAR effects

As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, in Italian all the embedded (non-imperfect) indicative verbal forms—and not just the present tense—are evaluated twice. The evaluation takes place with respect to two sets of temporal coordinates: the coordinate of the subject—or better to say, the bearer of the attitude—and the coordinate of the speaker. Let me briefly summarize the relevant points.

The starting observation, discussed in Chapter 2, is that typologically there are no languages in which the embedded verbal form is evaluated exclusively indexically. That is, in no language might a sentence such as *Gianni said that Maria is pregnant* mean that Maria is pregnant *now*, but *not* at the time of Gianni's saying it. There are only two types of languages: the Italian (English)-like ones—with

DAR—and the Chinese-like ones—non-DAR languages, where the embedded eventuality is only anchored to the superordinate clause. Therefore anchoring to the superordinate event is obligatory, as a property of UG. On the other hand, the anchoring of the embedded eventuality to the utterance event only obtains with DAR.

In the preceding chapters I proposed a syntactic implementation of this view, and argued that in the syntactic structure itself there are two projections that are read off at the interface as pointers to the respective set of coordinates. The anchoring with the superordinate event—i.e., the evaluation of the embedded event with respect to the subject's temporal coordinate—takes place in the projection T where the verbal tense appears. Tense moves then to C, where the embedded event is evaluated with respect to the speaker's temporal location. Under the present approach, in fact, the highest projection in the C-layer contains the features that, at the interface, are interpreted as pointing to the utterance event itself. Consider again the sentence discussed above in Chapter 2:

- (61) Gianni ha detto [_{C^{speaker}} che [_C Maria [_{T^{subject}} è incinta]]]
Gianni said that Maria is pregnant

The eventuality of *being pregnant* overlaps—henceforth notated as '≈'—with the *saying* event. When T moves to C, it enters into a relation with the speaker's coordinate—i.e., with the utterance event. The relation to be interpreted at the interface is the following: $e_{\text{being pregnant}} \approx e_{\text{utterance}}$. The eventuality *being pregnant* is therefore overlapping with the utterance event as well, hence the DAR. In the previous chapters I proposed that this relation between T and C is instantiated when the embedded verbal form is an indicative. In a sense, it might be said that this is what being an indicative amounts to—cf. also the discussion of the Italian imperfect and the English past in Chapter 4.

A verbal form embedded under a future of a saying predicate is an indicative and therefore is expected to be subject to the same generalizations concerning the indicative. The point in question is exactly this: it does not. There are two possible ways out: either we deny that a verbal form embedded under a future maintains the general properties of indicative verbs, or we demonstrate that, contrary to appearances, the DAR holds in these contexts as well.

This latter hypothesis has the advantage that it could also provide a solution to the problem concerning the distribution of anaphoric temporal locutions. As I remarked above, such locutions do not occur in DAR contexts. In fact, as illustrated above, they do not occur in future embedded contexts either. Therefore the assimilation of future embedded contexts to DAR ones would yield the correct results.

The hypothesis I discuss in this section runs as follows. The projection of the high Complementizer C of the future embedded clause contains the speaker's coordinate, like the other indicative contexts. The difference with a main future is that in these contexts the speaker assumes the perspective of the subject—i.e., of the attitude bearer. The *meaning* of the future is therefore the shifting of the temporal coordinate of the speaker to the temporal location of the subject.

In other words, interpretively the temporal location of the main event becomes the (new) temporal location of the speaker, who therefore, with respect to the subordinate event, ends up having the same temporal location as the subject. Importantly, in this way the *syntax* of the embedded clause is computed exactly as in all the other cases: there is no difference at all between a clause depending on a main past and a clause depending on a main future with respect to the syntactic properties. The difference only resides in the specific value assigned to the speaker's coordinate at the interpretive interface.

Here I will work out the cases presented above, to show that this is exactly what happens. Consider now an embedded past:

- (62) Gianni dirà [_{C_{speaker=subject}} che_C Maria [_{T_{-subject}} è partita]]
Gianni will say that Maria left

In T, the embedded event is interpreted as a past with respect to the temporal location of the subject. Consequently, the leaving precedes the saying. When in C, it is interpreted as a past with respect to the speaker's coordinate. The speaker's coordinate, however, has been reset to the subject coordinate—i.e., the saying event again. Therefore, the Double Access Reading of these contexts locates the embedded event twice with respect to the saying. It never locates it with respect to the utterance event. The resetting operation is an interface one, as part of the meaning assigned to the future. Syntactically, everything is

as described in Chapter 2. Namely, C-speaker is projected out of the numeration, but its *value* is not *now*, but Gianni's temporal location.

Let's consider the interpretive process in more detail. The first step proceeds on a par with the contexts depending from a past: the anchoring procedure locates the embedded event with respect to the main event. In the second step, when T moves to C, the leaving is located with respect to the event defining the temporal coordinate of the speaker. Again, this move parallels the interpretation of tenses depending from a past. In the case of a main future, however, the event defining the speaker coordinate is a different one. In the main clauses—as in clauses depending from a past—the event defining the temporal coordinate of the speaker is the utterance event, *u*. By contrast, when the embedded context depends from a future, the event defining the speaker's coordinate is not *u*, but coincides with the main event. Let's call it *u'*. In other words, the main event provides a new set of coordinates for the speaker. In section 5.5 I briefly address the question of the *resetting* of the speaker's coordinate.

This hypothesis can explain how it is possible for an embedded indicative verbal form not to manifest DAR effects—as if it were a subjunctive or an imperfect—while maintaining the properties of an indicative. The peculiarity of future contexts is not constituted by the fact that the anchoring procedures are *different*—they are not—but by the *resetting* of the speaker's coordinate. Namely, the speaker looks at the embedded event from the perspective of the bearer-of-attitude.¹⁴

¹⁴ Higginbotham (p.c.) notes that in some cases the speaker's coordinate is actually not reset. In these examples a strong context must be provided to ensure that the salient event locating the speaker is the utterance event *u* and no shifting to *u'* is possible. Consider the following examples (Higginbotham p.c.):

- i. Guarda come balla bene Maria! Domani dirai che sta ballando bene

Look how well Maria is dancing! Tomorrow you will say that she is dancing well

The embedded verbal form is interpreted with respect to *u* and there is no resetting to *u'*. This interpretation, however, must be *forced* by the context. It is impossible to have in an out-of-the-blue sentence, such as the following:

- ii. Domani Gianni dirà che Maria sta ballando bene

Tomorrow Gianni will say that Maria is dancing well

In the absence of a strong context, it is impossible to interpret the embedded dancing as simultaneous to the utterance time *u*. The only possible interpretation makes it simultaneous with the saying by Gianni, which lies in the future with respect to *u*.

The derivation of an embedded present proceeds along the same lines:

- (63) Gianni dirà [_{C speaker=subject} che_C Maria [_{T-subject} è incinta]]
Gianni will say that Maria is pregnant

The pregnancy must only hold at the time Gianni speaks about it and does not have to hold at the utterance time u . The same process I described above yields the correct interpretation in this case as well. The future introduces a temporal location u' , relocating the speaker coordinate at the time of Gianni's *saying*. Therefore u' coincides with e_{saying} . The pregnancy is therefore taken to hold at the time of e_{saying} and, once T moves to C, at u' —i.e., the reset temporal location of the speaker. However, u' is nothing else than the saying event. Therefore, even if the embedded eventuality is temporally evaluated twice, it turns out to overlap only with the saying and not with the utterance event u . Note that, as above, syntactically everything works as described in the normal cases discussed in Chapter 2.

Interestingly, the following sentence sounds odd:

- (64) Fra due anni Gianni dirà che Maria adesso è incinta
In two years Gianni will say that now Maria is pregnant

The state of pregnancy is specified as holding *now*, i.e., at u . The embedded present must be anchored to the saying and therefore it must also coincide with it: $e_{being\ pregnant} \approx e_{saying}$. Then it is located with respect to u' (the saying, again), i.e., the reset speaker's coordinate. The e_{saying} however is located *fra due anni* (in two years). Given what we know about human beings, this is not a sound reading.

To conclude, the presence of the indexicals in this case induces an evaluation of the embedded eventuality with respect to *now*. The oddity of sentence (64), however, is entirely due to the presence of the temporal adverbs and not to the fact that the embedded event must be evaluated with respect to *now* as a rule.

The interpretation of the embedded future follows, trivially:

- (65) Gianni dirà [_{C speaker=subject} che_C Maria [_{T-subject} partirà]]
Gianni will say that Maria will leave

The leaving is located after the saying, which is itself in the future. Consequently, the relocating of the speaker coordinate does not affect the interpretation of the embedded event.

5.4.2 *Towards an explanation of the distribution of temporal locutions*

5.4.2.1 *Indexical temporal locutions* In this section I apply my proposal to the distribution of the temporal locutions. Consider the following example:

- (66) Oggi è il 25 dicembre. Il 27, Gianni dirà che Maria è partita il 26/*domani/*il giorno prima
 Today is 25 December. On the 27th, Gianni will say that Maria left on the 26th/*tomorrow/*the day before

As illustrated above, in the past contexts depending from a future, both the anaphoric and the indexical temporal locution have an anomalous distribution, in that neither one is acceptable. Only the referential one is grammatical. Consider also the following case, with an embedded imperfect:

- (67) Oggi è il 25 dicembre. Il 27, Gianni dirà che Maria era partita il giorno prima
 Today is 25 December. On the 27th, Gianni will say that Maria left (IMPF) the day before

The imperfect in the embedded clause sharply contrasts with the corresponding example in (66), in that the anaphoric temporal locution is grammatical.

Let us consider sentence (66). An indexical such as *domani* (tomorrow) places the event in the future with respect to the speaker's coordinate: $u > t_{domani}(e_{leaving})$. The utterance time precedes the time of the leaving, which is *tomorrow*. When the temporal predicate in T is interpreted, the leaving is located before the saying: $e_{leaving} > e_{saying}$. At this point *therefore*, the event $e_{leaving}$ is in the future with respect to the speaker and in the past with respect to bearer of attitude. Then, T moves to C where the speaker's coordinate u is reset to u' , i.e., the time of the saying. The leaving at this point must be located in the past with respect to the speaker's coordinate u' . As a

consequence, a problem arises: the leaving has already being located by means of *tomorrow* in the *future* of the speaker, and now, by virtue of the resetting of u to u' , it should be located in her *past*. This is impossible and the sentence turns out unacceptable. Ultimately, therefore, the reason *domani* is not admitted in these contexts is the same as in main clauses: **Gianni left tomorrow*. If something is located in the future with respect to the speaker, by means of *domani*, then it cannot simultaneously be located in her past, by means of verbal morphology. The difference is that in this case this result is obtained indirectly, by virtue of the resetting of u to u' .

The same reasoning holds even when *domani* locates an event expressed in a nominal structure—cf. examples (39)–(41) above, repeated here:

- (68) *Dopodomani Gianni dirà che [la tua partenza di domani] è necessaria
The day after tomorrow Gianni will say that your leaving tomorrow is necessary
- (69) Dopodomani Gianni dirà che [la tua partenza è stata necessaria]
The day after tomorrow Gianni will say that your leaving tomorrow was necessary
- (70) Gianni dirà che [la tua partenza di domani] è necessaria
The day after tomorrow Gianni will say that your leaving tomorrow is necessary

In sentence (68), the saying event is located in the future by means of the temporal locution *the day after tomorrow*, so that the leaving is located in the past with respect to it, being specified as taking place *tomorrow*. *Tomorrow* also locates the leaving event in the future of the speaker. But then in the embedded clause u is reset to u' , i.e., the saying event. Therefore, the event of leaving should be simultaneously located in the future of the speaker—by means of *tomorrow*—and in her past, given that the leaving has to *precede* the saying. This is impossible, and the structure is unacceptable.

Examples (69) and (70) are both grammatical. In sentence (69) the leaving is located in the past with respect to the saying, and we do not know whether it is also located in the past with respect to the utterance event u or not. All we know is that $e_{\text{leaving}} > e_{\text{saying}}$.

Consequently, when u is reset to u' , nothing changes and the sentence is grammatical.

In sentence (70) the leaving is specified as occurring in the future with respect to the speaker, by means of *tomorrow*: $u > e_{\text{leaving}}$. When u is reset to u' , then the leaving must follow u' , the saying, as well. In this case this is possible, contrasting with (68), given that there is no specification forcing the location of the saying to be posterior to the leaving. In (70), therefore, the leaving follows both the utterance time *and* the saying, as in the following case:

- (71) Fra un'ora Gianni dirà che la tua partenza di domani è necessaria
In one hour Gianni will say that your leaving tomorrow is necessary

The same pattern can be found in infinitival complements:

- (72) Gianni dirà di essere partito (*domani)
Lit: Gianni will say to have left (tomorrow)
Gianni will say he left tomorrow

The leaving must precede the saying: $e_{\text{leaving}} > e_{\text{saying}}$. It is also located by means of *tomorrow* in the future of the speaker: $u > e_{\text{leaving}}$. When u is reset to u' , i.e., the saying, then it ends up being located both before and after the saying: $u'(e_{\text{saying}}) > e_{\text{leaving}}$. This yields unacceptability.

Let us consider now the distribution of the futurate present and of the future:

- (73) *Dopodomani Gianni dirà che Maria parte/partirà domani
The day after tomorrow Gianni will say that Maria leaves/will leave tomorrow
- (74) Dopodomani Gianni dirà che Maria parte/partirà
The day after tomorrow Gianni will say that Maria leaves/will leave
- (75) Gianni dirà che Maria parte/partirà domani
Gianni will say that Maria leaves/will leave tomorrow

The embedded form in (73) must be located in the future with respect to the saying, like *partirà* (will leave): $e_{\text{saying}} > e_{\text{leaving}}$. The presence of *tomorrow* locates the event after u : $u > e_{\text{leaving}}$. Then u is reset to u' , yielding $u' > e_{\text{leaving}}$. So far everything works, and the sentence is acceptable—as is the case with example (75)—having the same

indexical specification in the embedded clause. However, the presence of *dopodomani* in the main clause of (73) gives rise to unacceptability, given that it forces an ordering between the saying and the leaving such that $e_{\text{leaving}} > e_{\text{saying}}$, contrasting with the ordering obtained through temporal anchoring. As expected, if the temporal adverb *domani* does not appear in the sentence, as in (74), no problem arises.

Notice also that in sentence (75), in order to preserve the interpretation in which the saying precedes the leaving, *tomorrow* turns out to be both *the day after u* and *the day after u'*. In other words, the acceptable interpretation implies that Gianni spoke *today*, and that therefore the day identified as *tomorrow* by the speaker is also identifiable as *tomorrow* by Gianni. In this case, therefore, the time span identified by *domani* is preserved both with respect to *u* and with respect to *u'*.

Let us consider briefly the distribution of *ieri* (yesterday), i.e., the temporal mirror image of *tomorrow*. Consider the following examples:

- (76) Gianni dirà che Maria è partita ieri
Gianni will say that Maria left yesterday

The adverb *ieri* locates the leaving event in the past with respect to *u*: $e_{\text{leaving}} > u$. The anchoring process locates the leaving before the saying: $e_{\text{leaving}} > e_{\text{saying}}$. Finally, *u* is reset to *u'*—the saying again—and therefore $e_{\text{leaving}} > u'$. No problem arises and the sentence is therefore acceptable.

Now the question arises concerning the precise interpretation of the time span identified by *ieri* (yesterday)—i.e., the day before the day of the utterance event. It seems to me that it does not have to be preserved, in that the only requirement to be met is the relative ordering of the events. In other words, the day of the event is identified only on the basis of the time of *u*. The relative ordering requirement—i.e., $e_{\text{leaving}} > e_{\text{saying}}$, $e_{\text{leaving}} > u$ and $e_{\text{leaving}} > u'$ —can be met even if the utterance event and the saying event occur in different days, as for instance in the following case:

- (77) Dopodomani Gianni dirà che Maria è partita ieri
The day after tomorrow Gianni will say that Maria left yesterday

The speaker's *yesterday* in this case does not coincide with Gianni's *yesterday*, but the sentence is nevertheless acceptable. On the other hand, this is the case even in the past under past clauses:

- (78) Ieri Gianni ha detto che Maria è partita l'altro ieri
Yesterday Gianni said that Maria left the day before yesterday

The day before yesterday is such only with respect to the speaker, and not to the subject Gianni.¹⁵

In other words, even in those cases where there is no resetting of the temporal coordinate, the combined result of the temporal anchoring and of the location of the events according to the indexical locutions must be coherent. Consider in fact that a sentence inverting the temporal specification given in (78)—i.e., where the embedded event is located *ieri* (yesterday) and the main one *l'altro ieri* (the day before yesterday)—yields the opposite ordering of the events and is consequently unacceptable:

- (79) #L'altro ieri Gianni ha detto che Maria è partita ieri
The day before yesterday Gianni said that Maria left yesterday

In (79) the anchoring process orders the leaving before the saying. This result contrasts with the relative ordering induced by the temporal locutions, hence the oddity of the sentence.

In Italian, the coherence of the relative ordering is the only condition to be met, whereas in English, and maybe in other languages as

¹⁵ For some English speakers these sentences turn out to be unacceptable. It might be the case that in English the time span identified by the indexical has to be preserved throughout the sentence. That is, the indexical not only places the event in the past or in the future of the speaker, but also establishes a specific temporal relation with the other events (Higginbotham, p.c.). In this perspective, in sentence (78) a locution such as *the day before yesterday* would locate the event in the past of the speaker *and* in the day before the day preceding the utterance event, when evaluated with respect to *u*. When the embedded event is evaluated with respect to the saying of *Gianni*, the temporal locution locates it in the past of *Gianni*, and also in the day preceding the day before *Gianni's* saying. In Italian the process would not take place in the same way. The temporal locution only locates the event in the past, or in the future of the speaker. As I have shown in this chapter, its temporal location must be coherent with the anchoring process, so that if *u* is reset to *u'* the relative order of the events can be maintained.

well, it looks likely that every time the event is temporally evaluated, the time span identified by the indexical is also interpreted. Consider the following example:

(80) John said that Mary left yesterday

In English this sentence is acceptable only if John said it *today*.

To conclude, it is possible that the indexical temporal locutions behave in slightly different ways across languages, so that the status of (79), for instance, might vary from one language to another. However, what all languages, at least all DAR languages, have in common, is that the temporal anchoring and the locating of the event in time by means of temporal adverbs interact with each other in ways which are grammatically, and syntactically, defined.

5.4.2.2 *Anaphoric temporal locutions* Let us now consider the distribution of anaphoric temporal locutions such as *il giorno prima/dopo* (the day before/after). As I remarked in section 5.3.3, Giorgi and Pianesi (2003) showed that the temporal variable x , necessary for interpreting *before* and *after*, cannot pick up its reference from u . Therefore, as pointed out above, an out-of-the-blue sentence such as (81) is infelicitous:

(81) #Gianni è partito il giorno prima
Gianni left the day before

If no possible antecedent for x , in *the day before* (*the day x*), is present in the context, the sentence is ill-formed. The point of interest here is that example (81) cannot mean *Gianni left the day before the day of the utterance*. Recall that u on the other hand is available as an anchoring point for the past tense, as shown by the fact that the leaving is located in the past with respect to it: $e_{\text{leaving}} > u$. On the other hand, antecedenthood can be provided by the context external to the sentence, as in example (45), here repeated for simplicity:

(82) A: Maria è partita il 23 marzo B: Ma no! È partita il giorno prima
A: Maria left on 23 March B: No! She left the day before

The contrast between (81) and (82) shows that anaphoric temporal locutions are not *per se* incompatible with the indicative forms; the incompatibility is specifically between x and u .

In embedded clauses, this incompatibility extends to all DAR contexts, which necessarily involve evaluation of the embedded event with respect to u . The way out is to substitute the ‘normal’ indicative, with the imperfect, which does not require such an evaluation. Consider the following contrasts (examples (49) and (50) given above, here repeated):

- (83) *Il 28 dicembre/dopodomani Gianni dirà che Maria è partita il giorno prima
On 28 December/the day after tomorrow Gianni will say that Maria left the day before
- (84) Il 28 dicembre/dopodomani Gianni dirà che Maria era partita il giorno prima
On 28 December/the day after tomorrow Gianni will say that Maria had(IMP) left the day before

The sentence in (84) is not subject to the DAR, in that the imperfect does not need to be evaluated in C with respect to the speaker’s coordinate. The fact that u is reset to u' does not matter, given that the reasons for the original incompatibility between the anaphoric temporal locution and the speaker’s coordinate persist in spite of its relocation.

This contrast is a strong argument in favour of the analysis proposed here. Even if a sentence such as (83) is not at first sight a *double* access sentence, it still exhibits a DAR pattern. The idea I am advocating here is that this is a DAR context *in disguise*, given that the speaker’s and the subject’s coordinates are made to coincide. Therefore, the distribution of the items that are sensitive to the presence of the speaker’s coordinate does not vary.

The example in (84) gives rise to the same temporal interpretation as (83) with respect to the location of the events: $u > e_{leaving} > e_{saying}$. The only difference is that the embedded event is not re-evaluated with respect to u' in C. This makes it possible for the anaphoric locution to appear in this context.

5.5 Further speculations and conclusions

Note that all the examples I discussed in the preceding section are not syntactically marked. The basic idea of this chapter is that, even if this does not seem to be the case, the syntactic computation in these contexts is exactly as described for ‘normal’ cases. The only difference is that interpretively, and once again *not* syntactically, the speaker’s temporal coordinate takes over a peculiar value—a resetting—due to the meaning of the main verbal form. Now, the issue concerns the precise implementation, at the interpretive level, of this resetting idea. Here I do not have a definite answer, and actually this book is mostly about syntax, but I do have a suggestion: whatever happens in these contexts has some property in common with certain kinds of counterfactuals.

More precisely, in this section I address the following question: why are the contexts created by a future different from those created by a past verbal form?

As I said above, I am not able to provide an exhaustive answer, but I try to show that the contexts in question have something in common, in the relevant respect, with counterfactuals. Therefore one might expect that whatever accounts for the peculiar properties of counterfactuals might also account for these cases.

According to the proposal sketched above, the crucial properties, from which all the others follow, is the peculiarity of the future of resetting u to u' , so that the speaker assumes the subject’s perspective with respect to the embedded event.

As far as I can see, besides these contexts, the resetting of indexicals is possible in sentences like the following one:¹⁶

(85) If I were you, I would marry me

The value of I , which is indexically identified, is reset in this context, by means of the *if*-clause, to the value of another individual, *you*. In the main clause, the two instances of the first person pronoun,

¹⁶ A reviewer points out that this sentence is acceptable only in a semi-humorous deviation from the norm. What is interesting here, however, is the possibility for this sentence to exist at all. In the next chapter I will analyse some stylistic devices which produce various narrative effects.

allegedly referring to the speaker, must be kept distinct, as shown by the oddness of the following sentence:

(86) #If I were you, I would marry myself

The reflexive pronoun *myself* must refer back to *I* and cannot take a reference distinct from that of its antecedent. Note that the reason for the unacceptability of (86) does not lie in the syntax. Principles A and B of the Binding Theory are computed in exactly the way we expect them to be: *me*, as a pronoun in sentence (85), is disjoint from *I*, since the latter is in the same local domain. Analogously, in sentence (86), *myself* must be locally bound, hence it is bound by *I*. The anomaly of the judgement, which is exactly the reverse of what seems to be predicted by the Binding Theory, is due to the presence of the preceding *if*-clause, which intervenes on the reference of the first person pronoun. Since *I* does not refer to *speaker* any more, but to *hearer*, it is as a matter of fact disjoint from *me* in (85), and, conversely, cannot be a suitable antecedent for *myself* in (86).

The similarities between this context and those discussed in the preceding sections concern the fact that the future operates the same sort of resetting as is illustrated above. It does not operate on the reference of pronouns, but on temporal coordinates. Tentatively, one could propose that the future introduces a counterfactual operator, which has the effect of shifting the temporal coordinate of the speaker from u to u' . In the superordinate clause the coordinate to be taken into account is u ; in the subordinate clause u' must be considered as the relevant coordinate. In a sense, therefore, they must both be present, but kept distinct.

In conclusion, in this chapter I have argued that the contexts created by a future are DAR contexts, and therefore do not constitute an exception to the generalization discussed in the preceding chapters. DAR effects show up once the phenomena are considered in greater detail and in particular when investigated with respect to the distribution of temporal locutions. Giorgi and Pianesi (2003) in fact argued that anaphoric temporal locutions, as opposed to indexical and referential ones, cannot appear in those contexts where anchoring to the speaker's coordinate is required. By using this as a test, it is possible to observe that future contexts are indeed incompatible with anaphoric temporal locutions. Under the

hypothesis that the contexts embedded under a future are DAR ones, the distribution of the indicative verbal forms is no longer an exception.

The only additional hypothesis required concerns the resetting of the speaker's coordinate: the speaker assumes the perspective of the subject by virtue of its intrinsic meaning, perhaps as a counterfactual-like element.